THE UNIVERSITY
OF ILLINOIS
LIBRARY
052
EN
v.9

THE

ENGLISH REVIEW.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS LIBRARY

VOL. IX.

MARCH

~~DECEMBER~~—*JUNE.*

LONDON:
FRANCIS & JOHN RIVINGTON,
ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD, & WATERLOO PLACE.

1848.

LONDON:
GILBERT & RIVINGTON, PRINTERS,
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

052
EN
v.9

CONTENTS

OF

No. XVII.

ART. PAGE

I.—Erinnerungen an Wilhelm von Humboldt. Von Gustav Schlesier.
Reminiscences of William von Humboldt. By Gustavus Schlesier 1

II.—1. Substance of Lectures delivered in the Churches. By Henry Drummond.
2. A Discourse on the Office of Apostle.
3. The Liturgy and other Divine Offices of the Church 13

III.—1. Adventures in the Pacific, &c. By John Coulter, M.D.
2. Adventures on the Western Coast of South America, and the Interior of California, including a Narrative of Incidents at the Kingsmill Islands, New Ireland, New Britain, New Guinea, and other Islands in the Pacific Ocean. By J. Coulter, M.D.
3. Typee; or, a Narrative of a Four Months' Residence among the Natives of a Valley of the Marquesas Islands. By Herman Melville.
4. Omoo: a Narrative of Adventures in the South Seas, being a Sequel to the "Residence in the Marquesas Islands." By Herman Melville..... 51

IV.—1. Essays and Sermons. By the Rev. Henry Woodward, A.M., formerly of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, Rector of Fethard, in the Diocese of Cashel.
2. The Shunammite. By the Same.
3. Some Passages of my Former Life. By the Same.
4. Short Readings; Essays; and Sermons. By the Same .. 85

277515

ART. PAGE

V.—1. The Bull "In Cœnâ Domini" translated into English, with a short Historical Introduction; and evidence of its present validity, as part of the Roman law, and of its recognition by the Romish Hierarchy in Ireland. Published for the National Club.

2. A Letter to the Earl of Arundel and Surrey on the Bull "In Cœnâ Domini," by the Editor of the Bull, as published for the National Club.

3. Papal Diplomacy and the Bull "In Cœnâ Domini;" or a Collection of authentic Facts and Documents, proving that the principles of the Bull "In Cœnâ Domini" are the only principles of international law recognized by the Papacy. By the Editor of the Bull, as published for the National Club 90

VI.—1. Brownson's Quarterly Review, New Series, No. I. January, 1847; No. IV. October, 1847.

2. The Dublin Review, No. XLIV. July, 1847; No. XLVI. January, 1848 96

VII.—Letters of Dr. M'Hale to Lord Arundel, Lord Shrewsbury, and Lord John Russell..... 128

VIII.—1. The Christian State; or, the First Principles of National Religion. By the Rev. T. R. Birks, M.A., Rector of Kelshall, Herts.

2. Germany, England, and Scotland; or, Recollections of a Swiss Minister. By J. H. Merle D'Aubigné, D.D.

3. A Letter to the Right Hon. Lord John Russell, M.P., on the Admission of Jews into Parliament. By the Rev. T. R. Birks, M.A.

4. Relations of Church and State, &c. By J. R. Pretyman, M.A., Vicar of Aylesbury 157

Notices of Recent Publications, &c. 194

Foreign and Colonial Intelligence 231

THE

ENGLISH REVIEW.

MARCH, 1848.

ART. I.—*Erinnerungen an Wilhelm von Humboldt.* VON GUSTAV SCHLESIER. Stuttgart: Köhler.

Reminiscences of William von Humboldt. By GUSTAVUS SCHLESIER. Stuttgart.

LITERATURE has known a speedy development in Germany, and almost as speedy a decline. Lessing and Klopstock were the first great names. Then followed the graceful Wieland and the serious Herder. Then arose the two great boasts of the German language and nation, the ideal Schiller and the almost-universal Goethe. In the train of these, though partially opposed to them in the literary battles of the day, and ranged under another standard, came the romantic Tieck, the two Schlegels, the mystic Werner, the gloomy Kleist, and last, though not least, the eminently-artistic bard of Austria, Grillparzer. Such names as Müllner, or Kotzebue, or even Körner, cannot be cited in this roll of high degree; nor can we recognize the more modern lyric bards, some of whose earliest creations, however, date from the Augustan age of Germany, as worthy of admission into this category of literary aristocrats. Rückert, though kindly, and sweet, and graceful, has not sufficient power; Freiligrath, though animated, and vigorous, and picturesque, is too deficient in thought; Uhland, though generally pleasing, is too essentially common-place; and neither Karl Simrock, nor Chamisso, nor Gutzkow the dramatist, and still less Herwegh or Lenau, despite their various degrees of merit, can be classed with those master-minds, which wrought together in Germany towards the commencement of the nineteenth century.

It will be seen that we allude mainly to the poets among our Teutonic brethren. But these are also its greatest prose writers, Lessing, Wieland, Herder, Goethe, Schiller, and Tieck, being the classic prosaists of Germany; whilst Frederic von Schlegel has little merit as a bard, and can only live by his Philosophy of History, and other kindred works. In novel literature, however, our friends the Germans are not poor. The names most worthy of citation, besides those already given, including Kleist, are Jean Paul, Hoffman, Fouqué, and perhaps Zschocke; for neither Hauff nor Spindler, nor other moderns, can lay claim to

more than a secondary degree of merit. Their historians, including even Johannes von Müller, have not exercised a powerful influence on the national mind; and certainly their philosophers, or pseudo-philosophers, from Kant to Hegel, have not been of much service to German literature.

But to resume. Of all these really great men, (though in writing this, we feel that we are scarcely entitled to honour Augustus von Schlegel with such an appellation, despite his admirable translations,) two alone survive; Tieck, and the author of "Sappho," "The Golden Fleece," and "The Dream a Life," to whom we may possibly on some future occasion devote a special inquiry, one of the most classical of dramatists, severely chaste in design and execution, and yet intensely real, the partially unrecognized, but undoubtedly great, Grillparzer. *He* lives still, and not only lives, but writes: three of his most beautiful dramas have appeared within the last few years; but from various causes, mainly political, which it were too tedious to develop here, they have not attracted that attention, and excited that sympathy, which were due to their intrinsic merits. Grillparzer stands as a giant among a race of dwarfs, apparently more or less incapable to conceive his greatness: he will not yield his homage to all the petty tendencies of the hour; he is not content to swell the vulgar party cry which Gutzkow and his colleagues are shouting at the pitch of their voices; and he is neglected, accordingly, as our own great Southey has too long been among ourselves. Nevertheless, his time will come. But, with this remarkable exception, and that of Tieck, whose last work, "Vittoria Acorombona," has much merit, the great luminaries of Germany now shine only in the reflected glory of those works which have secured their earthly immortality.

We have before us the biography of a man who was the intimate friend, and even counsellor, of both Goethe and Schiller; of William von Humboldt, elder brother of the still living Alexander, author of "Kosmos;" one of the most remarkable thinkers, critics, practical statesmen, and diplomatists of his time, which was that of the great burst of literary genius above alluded to. As critic and thinker he more especially engages our attention: we see in him a contemporary of the greatest German authors, recognized by them as their co-equal; as "ebenbürtig" (the Germans would express it) with themselves. And although the English reader may not pursue the inquiries into the æsthetic value of "the ideal" and "the natural," as philosophically conducted on Kantian and other recondite principles by Humboldt and Schiller, with the same minute attention which German thinkers no doubt bestow on them, nevertheless all who are in any degree interested in German literature cannot but feel pleasure

in entering as it were the workshops of the great artists of a foreign land, penetrating into the recesses of their minds, and tracing their creations to their source; all which they may well do in the perusal of the work before us.

Charles William von Humboldt, generally known by the name of William only, was born on the 22nd of June, 1767, at Potsdam. His father was the Baron von Humboldt, a major in the Prussian army, and gentleman of the bedchamber to the king, generally reputed to be a man of sound sense and superior capacity. An interesting account is given of William's education with his brother Alexander. From the first both brothers, but more especially William, displayed an uncommon degree of ability. Their literary tendencies are clearly indicated in the following interesting passage, which we accordingly render at length.

"It may be safely asserted, that the education of both brothers was at once singularly many-sided and thoroughly solid. For, although both the desire exhibited for universality of knowledge, and the exactness with which inquiries on any special subject were conducted, were natural instincts of the Humboldts, still such instincts require to be developed by education and guidance, favour and opportunity. By the side of this universality, which went so far in the elder brother, William, that he expressed his wish to leave nothing on earth unknown, the eagerness appears the more remarkable, with which either threw himself upon his own special division of labour, Alexander addressing himself to natural science in its widest sense, William to classical antiquity, art, philosophy, and language. Whilst the former was destined to observe external nature under every form, animate and inanimate, in plants, beasts, and men, William forced his way into the innermost sanctuary of mankind, the spirit-world within, and language, its first creation. Though these territories, in which each of them sought his individual home, may appear remote from one another, yet do they approximate in many ways, and possess one common basis. Thus, if we examine William, we shall find in him also the student of external nature, but with this difference, that such study was to him but *the means* of investigating the internal world and its phenomena."

Subsequently we read;—

"He who heard Humboldt on special occasions discourse with his brother, or even with Goethe, would have imagined him to be a naturalist only; and would have been astounded, indeed, to recognize a spirit of a totally opposed order, when he conversed at other times with Goethe, or with Schiller, or with Wolf, the classical scholar."

William von Humboldt appears to have had much that was English in his character, intermingled, however, with a vast amount of Germanism. In his youth, and even throughout life, a certain tendency to sentiment, which is inseparable from all

true greatness, appears to have characterized his heart and soul: but he was habitually cold in semblance, rarely displaying emotion on the most solemn occasions. Thus, when saved from drowning by his friend Stieglitz, he expressed no deep gratitude to his friend, or affection for his distant loved ones; somewhat to the surprise of Varnhagen, who records the fact, and who would have been better pleased had he "made a scene" of it: to our satisfaction, on the contrary, who believe it to be the natural instinct of all men who feel deeply, to conceal emotions on such occasions beneath a playful exterior, and laugh and joke, as Humboldt did on the evening in question. We are not contending for constant reserve in all the actions of life: there are times at which reserve is totally out of place—when we can console or strengthen others. It is out of place, too, when we would convey to others our perceptions of the good, and great, and beautiful, and teach them to admire and love with us; and, more particularly, it is wholly out of place when the prayers of the faithful are to be led, or the devotional affections excited, within the house of God. But to resume: this external coldness, with the depth of affection beneath it, which characterized Humboldt, have certainly something English about them; though, perhaps, we might almost as well say Prussian, or, rather, *Berlinese.*

Few men appear to have combined so many distinctive and almost opposite qualities. "The great susceptibility for the perception of all beauty, which," as Schiller says, "made Humboldt an instinctive critic, in no degree excluded energy and activity from his character: with the utmost sensitiveness of feeling was combined the protective coldness of the understanding; and with the boldest elevation of thought, he coupled the minutest study of the dryest details of science." We cannot wonder that such a man should have been recognized by the very greatest among his countrymen, by a Goethe and Schiller, as their authorized privy-counsellor; or that his career should be deemed worthy of the closest investigation at the present day. As literary creator, he has not indeed left much behind him; but he is universally recognized as one of the most valuable of German critics; as one of the noblest of her statesmen (he was Prussian Minister of Public Instruction for several years); as one of the most successful of diplomatists (he represented Prussia at the Congress of Vienna); and as one of the very greatest linguists of all times and countries. Our readers therefore will not wonder at our directing their attention to the biography of such a man.

No doubt they will inquire, and with reason, was he a Christian? For to us, writing in a professedly and distinctly Christian publication, this must ever be the most important of all questions.

We cannot, alas! answer this question in the affirmative, nor can we altogether negative it. Our readers well know, no doubt, that dogmatic Christianity has been either opposed or strangely disregarded by the majority of German thinkers. Lessing led the attack, and Klopstock was no efficient opponent to Lessing. Wieland, though in his youth a Calvinist, to which fact several of his works bear record, was dissatisfied (as he well might be) with the external coldness and unphilosophical narrowness of his Genevan school, and took refuge in universal scepticism, having, indeed, nothing to turn to but cold and rationalistic Lutheranism, as it then existed, or Romanism, with all its false miracles, and pious frauds, and flagrant superstitions. Goethe followed, and confirmed the antichristian, or at least unchristian tendencies of German literature; he was too self-satisfied to require religion; too selfish, too "bequem," or cosily comfortable, to use his own expression. He has told us in his Auto-biography, that repentance always appeared to him tiresome and useless, since it could not bring back the past. A man who could speak thus was indeed remote from the spirit of Christianity. Even the ideal Schiller had not the courage, or perhaps the power, to stem the tide of infidelity.

We do not find one of these German poets or thinkers grappling with the historical difficulties of the question: they neither ventured to assert that our blessed Lord was an impostor (the only solid ground on which the infidel can stand); nor did they contend, with the more modern rationalists and transcendentalists, the German Paulus, the Englishman Carlyle, and the American Emerson, that CHRIST was totally misunderstood by his Apostles; that they themselves were self-deceived, and imagined they wrought miracles, spoke with tongues, &c., though they did nothing of the kind, eventually dying for a faith which was the phantom of their own fancies; nor had they taken refuge in the still more monstrous hypothesis of a Strauss, that the whole history of the New Testament was a myth, and that those who wrote it, without any mutual concert or intentional deception, imagined themselves to be simultaneously inspired, and placed on record as facts witnessed by themselves what never had any being, save in their own diseased imaginings. In truth, both Goethe and Schiller had too much good sense to be satisfied with such theories as these; and as they would not accept historical Christianity, they consequently contented themselves with placing it altogether on one side—with ignoring it, in a word; no doubt the easiest method to pursue. And thus did Humboldt also act, despite the sound sense, and love for practical reality and positive results, which he was in the habit of displaying on other occasions. His age and country were too much for him.

Let us hear his biographer. As, in his office of Public Instructor, it became his duty to supply the necessary funds, for the state religion, and in many ways influence and control its movements, the question naturally suggested itself, whether he was capacitated for such an office; and thus it is answered in the volume before us, after a very German fashion. "He has learnt little of Humboldt, and has seen little of his writings, who can doubt, whether or no he possessed religious feeling. But it is as certain that his religion always remained at a certain distance from positive Christianity; either because the shell of Christianity" (we suppose its dogmatic teaching) "was offensive to him, or because he feared to lose his spiritual freedom and individuality by yielding himself completely to its influence" (what a small fear!). "In this respect he exactly resembled the men of our great literary era, and though we cannot say that the boundaries of the eighteenth century confined him, we must declare him to have been its constant pupil upon this point. We have this characteristic expression of Humboldt's, 'All true knowledge leads to God.' No one of the philosophical systems of his day, was capable of satisfying his intellectual demands; his natural sense left him remote from all the more modern developments of this science. He was not a mere deist, and certainly not a pantheist." "His belief in the personality of the godhead, in a guiding Providence, and an individual immortality, was deeply grounded in him: and was connected, after a peculiar fashion, in part with the ancient dogma of fate, in part with such thesophic and historic-philosophical views, as have been prevalent since the earliest days among Indians, Greeks, and Germans. But he was not anxious to prove every thing, which he in faith conceived, and gladly fled with his most sacred treasures, into the realms of poetry, where nothing can appear too wonderful." (We translate freely here, the original being very awkwardly expressed.) Once more: "His attitude towards dogmatic religion was coldly reserved, but not inimical. He shunned too close approach to it, as though he feared to desecrate the Holy. And where he could not avoid it, he approached it as something positive, having actual existence, on which we all rest, avoiding closer inquiry."

We think that it will be sufficiently obvious to the thoughtful reader, from these remarks, that Humboldt, if he was indeed what he is here represented as being, would in all probability as an Englishman, have strenuously maintained that dogmatic Christianity which we not only ourselves profess, but of which we are at a loss to understand the rejection, by any man possessed of sound sense and integrity of will, devoting his attention to the subject. The truth is, that the absence of civil liberty in Germany was the

primary source of freethinking in theology. Human nature will have some subject for inquiry, for cavil, for possible negation. If politics, the natural food, be denied, religion must be assailed in its place; more especially if literary criticism, as in Lessing's writings, and German literature generally, be rather affirmative than negative. Men questioned the propriety of Divine laws, because they were not allowed to complain of human institutions, and being tongue-tied as to the errors of ministers and kings, they contented themselves with assaults on saints, and angels, and their God. Let Germany receive the representative constitution to which she is justly entitled, and the critical negation and unavoidable "opposition" of mankind will be directed to another and a safer channel. Men will have other things to cavil at besides texts of Scripture. The grandeur, and beauty, and unity of the Christian scheme will be recognized, and all minor objections will be felt unavailable, as opposed to the irresistible internal evidence of truth. Humboldt, however, believing in a personal God, a guiding Providence, and an individual immortality, had secured three of the great verities which Christianity has succeeded in impressing on the convictions of almost all who have come within her sphere; he was, too, a self-sacrificing friend, and one of the best of sons, of husbands, and of fathers. He did not think, with that epitome of absurdity and conceit, Emerson, (the praises of whom in Blackwood's Magazine are disgraceful to that periodical,) that prayer, as a means to effect a private end, is theft and meanness; *supposing* (presupposing?) *dualism, and not unity in nature and consciousness*:" that is, supposing God to be *above* man, and not to *be* man; he did not assert, with this self-satisfied scribbler, that "as soon as man is at one with God he will not beg;" that "men's prayers are a disease of the will, as are their creeds a disease of the intellect." —And here we must be permitted to ejaculate, what a compound of selfishness and villanous conceit this Emerson must be!—On the contrary, William von Burgsdorf tells us of his friend Humboldt, that when at Weimar, enjoying the society of Schiller, with his wife and children, but anxious for his mother's health, who was suffering from a severe attack which ended in death at Berlin, "he rarely retired for the night without first praying for his beloved mother." Thus, again, on his deathbed he said to those around him, his children and others, after a period of intense suffering, "Think often of me, but ever gladly. I have been happy, very happy: yesterday, too, was a beautiful day for me, in your love. I shall soon be with your mother, shall soon understand the ways of Providence."

But we do not strive to make Humboldt other than he was:

we take him as the genial thinker and philosopher, almost unconsciously imbued with much of the spirit of Christianity, with a loving heart and a natural reverence for his God; but wanting that patience for the shortcomings and intellectual weaknesses of his fellow men, which he might have attained in a clearer perception of his own sinfulness before his God. We have now said enough on this subject, and can turn our attention to other things, though want of time and space will compel us to be somewhat hasty in our remarks.

Despite the external coldness, which probably contributed in some degree to extract from Talleyrand the assertion,—"que c'était un des hommes d'état dont l'Europe de mon temps n'en a pas compté trois ou quatre," Humboldt remained an enthusiast ever, for the great, the beautiful, and the true. In his last letter to Schiller he writes, "Be convinced, my dear friend, that my interest, my tendencies, can never change. My measure for things remains unalterable: *ideas* are with me supreme. For these I have always lived, to these I shall ever remain faithful; and had I a circle of operation which included the virtual empire of Europe (like Bonaparte's), I should still regard it as a mere inferior means to a higher end; and such is the faith of my soul." Such a man, whose words and actions were always self-consistent, we cannot but respect, and almost love.

Our readers may ask for some one sample, however brief, of Humboldt's æsthetic criticism, which should justify the praises of a Goethe and a Schiller. We will quote a few lines from an essay published in 1791, which appear to us at once suggestive and correct.

"Poetry," he says, "is, in one point of view, the most perfect of all the fine arts: but in another, it is the weakest. While it represents its objects with less reality and animation than painting or sculpture, it cannot appeal to the feelings with the power of music. But these defects are soon forgotten; because poetry, independent of its universality, which has been treated on above, steps as it were nearest to the true man in man, interposes the least shadow betwixt *the thought* and its expression."

Again, he says,

"The Beautiful is a power; true Taste alone can gather all the tones of being into one entrancing harmony. Taste yields an internal calm and unity to all our sensations, physical, moral, and spiritual. Where Taste is wanting, desire is coarse and savage: Science without it may be deep and even sound, but never fruitful in its application. All spiritual perceptions, all treasures of knowledge, are vain without Taste, without the Beautiful: even moral nobility and strength are rough and displeasing, and void of power to feel or bless."

We should devote some paragraphs at least to the political opinions of such a statesman as Humboldt, particularly at the present moment, when the first principles of all government are at stake, and an European war of democratic propagandism is but too likely to ensue. These opinions are in some respects vague, Humboldt appears to have been altogether opposed to a so called pure or absolute democracy, and to have tended decidedly towards the system of constitutional monarchy; though he saw some advantages in absolute monarchy, which could not be realized under other systems. He was a strenuous advocate for individual liberty, thinking this of more import, than any power residing in the mass or community; but this liberty included so much in his eyes as to be almost equivalent to licence. The state, he thought, had nothing to do with morality, in as far as the sexual relations were concerned, or with religion. Marriage should be a private contract, to be kept or broken at the will of the contractors. State education, under any form, was undesirable, as involving a slavish uniformity of mind on the part of the instructed, who would be taught to be citizens and not men.

We need scarcely say in how far these views are opposed to our own. We hold that the nation or community, or the state as the nation's political embodiment, has a similar right with every individual to distinguish right from wrong for itself, in morals, and also in religion. That is, we think it qualified to recognize marriage as holy and binding, Christianity as truth, and the Church as the Church. With regard to education, we do not believe the fears of the Prussian statesman to be altogether groundless. Yet no state-education, no education at least based on religion, can reduce all children to the same flat level. Mind will always assert its prerogative. We would have whatever religious instruction is afforded in national schools based on that religion which is nationally recognized and established. Children, whose parents wished them to obtain other religious teaching, might retire after the hours of general instruction, and seek it privately elsewhere. We are indeed convinced that any state, not animated by the living spirit of Christianity, would make machines of those on whom it exercised too direct an influence; and thus far we agree with the hero of the work before us.

Despite some crotchets, however, we recognize much sound sense in Humboldt's political philosophy. Thus he demanded, as the editor of this biography says, "Partition of the legislative power betwixt the executive and the people; the utmost possible publicity for all government proceedings; finally, control over the execution of the law possessed by the subject;" involving, we presume, our English trial by jury, and system of magistracy.

Schlesier, our author, remarks: "The principle of the partition of legislative power consists in *this*, that no legal or constitutional change can be effected by either branch alone. This is the theory of counteraction, which daily gains ground in Germany, and will soon obtain supremacy." We are very glad to hear it, for it is the only rational political theory we are acquainted with. However, Mr. Schlesier informs us, *à propos* of another German statesman's praises of the British constitution, as realizing this division of power, that Humboldt could not possibly admire, or, at least approve of, the British system. Why, we are left to conjecture; but, we presume, because our hereditary aristocracy, the peerage, is displeasing to our German friend. He does not see that this affords an additional and, indeed, indispensable security to the balance of power. For that balance cannot be at all maintained, when, as in the case above assumed, the people and the executive are the two only agents of power. We have seen an experiment of this nature tried in France for the last thirty years, and must be by this time, after two revolutions, convinced, that a constitutional monarchy cannot exist without a real and not nominal, a powerful and yet popular, aristocracy. This we have, and have long had, in England; and because we have it, our constitution still exists. The late monarch of France strove to make bribery and corruption, with a very restricted right of franchise, supply the place of an aristocracy. We need not say in how far he has failed.

And now abandoning the stormy field of politics, let us linger for a few moments in the bower of the muses. There is matter for a long and careful essay on the literary relations of William von Humboldt with Schiller and Goethe. Schiller, it should be observed, was his especial friend and favourite. Perhaps, indeed, he admired Goethe most, but he appears to have sympathized far more keenly with Schiller. Let us content ourselves for to-day with a remarkable extract from a letter addressed by Humboldt to Schiller, in which his literary confession of faith will be found worthy of the reader's attention. "The imagination of the Greeks," says he, "was ever subject to the influences of Nature: thence its wondrous calm and clearness; thence, also, from its confinement within the boundaries of the world of sense, its unspirituality, which, contrasted with the most thoughtful productions of the moderns, seems almost poverty. In the moderns this clear response to the external world, this susceptibility to the influences of Nature, will not be discovered; the spiritual intention, taking various directions, is every where manifest. Thence their greater depth of meaning; but also their dissimilarity amongst themselves, national and other indirect causes existing for these various ten-

dencies. Thus, both Italians and English are characterized by poetical imagination, which is gay and sensual in the former, deeper, and nearer allied with feeling, in the latter. In the Germans intellectual intention and true sentiment are prominent: Goethe is especially remarkable in the latter respect, more particularly in his plays, Egmont, Faust, and Tasso, which are neither Greek nor English, but wholely and solely original. In you, my dear friend, the intellectual intention is most visible, but this by no means excludes other qualities." In another place he greets Schiller, for his combination of the spiritual and intellectual with the natural, as "the most modern of all modern bards." There is truth in these remarks, though the German critic must be owned to have claimed, with a perhaps pardonable partiality, the lion's share for his own countrymen. But we also should say, that on the whole, English poetry was more characterized by poetic imagination than any other quality; Spanish by richness and copiousness; Italian by fancy; French by invention, taste, and finish; German by intellectual intention, and feeling; though we are not willing to abandon this latter quality to any foreign nation, remembering our own stores of bardic wealth. And here we may be allowed to remark, that we distinctively claim supremacy for our own poetry, as also for our literature generally, over that of any other country. Every nation, even if national vanity suggested the assertion of its own primacy, would place us second in the roll of degree; nor can we conceive how the Germans even can venture to oppose the few great names which they may muster, to our long series of glorious bardic memories.

Of Humboldt's long and valuable Essay on Poetry and its Principles, in connexion with Goethe's exquisite "Hermann and Dorothea," we can merely say that it is well worthy of the perusal of all students of German literature; and Schiller's admirable reply, in which he maintains the superiority of the creative artist to the critic, who can never thoroughly express his own sensations of delight, and who, with all his writing, never touches the essence, the central core of an inspired creation, must also be dismissed by us with a brief general encomium. We must pause, however, to protest against the somewhat flippant comments of our author, Schlesier, on the later productions of Goethe, whether in poetry or prose, which he declares to be altogether valueless. We should have thought that Goethe's own crushing blows on the little critics who snapped around him in his lifetime, would have silenced such tiresome impertinence for ever. The truth is, that Goethe's prose was noble to the last, though somewhat stiff; that his second part of Faust, published the year before his death, was replete with magnificent poetry; and that his oriental series of

lyrics, the so-called "West Eastern Divan," the fruit of his latter years, so far from being an utter failure, is characterized by an almost miraculous freshness of thought, and feeling, and truly Goethian beauty. Writers like Mr. Schlesier should beware of negative criticism in such cases, by which they can only make themselves ridiculous. Nevertheless, we cannot withhold from Mr. Schlesier the general meed of impartiality, veracity, painstaking care, and no small degree of talent. He has conferred a benefit on the literary world, and it would be ungrateful in us not to tender him our thanks for the pleasure and instruction his work has afforded us.

We shall not follow William von Humboldt through his long and honourable career, having already exceeded the space which we had allotted to our labours. One remark let us be allowed to make in conclusion. William von Humboldt is the realization of a noble German character: he is the type of what thousands may become under the influence of that constitutional liberty, the full enjoyment of which should not be delayed another hour. We know not whether these pages will meet the eye of the present Prussian monarch, but here do we warn him that the hour for doubt and hesitation has passed: that if he would not abandon Germany to the almost immediate triumph of democracy, he must deprive the vast majority of the titled class in his country of their titular nobility, yielding them some appellation corresponding to our English esquire in its stead, and, further, form a chamber of peers from the mediatized princes, associated with some of the richest men in the country; the eldest son of each of whom should alone inherit the peerage. Then, having thus popularized the nobility, by an act of absolute but indispensable power, let him share the right of legislation with his parliament and people.

Art. II.—1. *Substance of Lectures delivered in the Churches. By* Henry Drummond. London, 1847.

2. *A Discourse on the Office of Apostle.* London, 1848.

3. *The Liturgy and other Divine Offices of the Church.* No date.

Future Church historians—if the world last long enough—may possibly be as much puzzled by the rival developments of Newman and Newman-street in the nineteenth, as former Church historians have been by the rival schisms of Novatus and Novatian in the third century. In both cases, too, there happens to be innovation in the name as well as in the thing; but the credit of that pun belongs to fate; all we have to do with it, is to point it out. Of old Carthage and Rome, of late Oxford and London, have furnished their contingents of unsoundness in the faith; and of late, as of old, the similarity, not of name only, but of error, in divergent lines of separation, is sufficiently strong to induce in the minds of distant observers a danger of confusion, and to suggest the propriety of adhering to the most tangible point of difference, that of locality, by distinguishing, as formerly between African and Roman Novatians, so now between Oxford and London Newmanites.

Having thrown out this hint for the benefit of the writer of some future "Natural History of Heresy and Schism,"—an exceedingly curious and instructive book, we venture to predict, if ever it should be written,—we now turn into the straight path of our present duty, by placing within the focus of the hydro-oxygen microscope of truth the strange theological *infusoria*, the best description of whose whereabout is,—*da veniam, lector,—turning out*, not of Oxford, but of Oxford-street. They are, as is mostly the case with animalcules, the offspring of troubled waters. It was during that heavy gale of European politics, which

> "*maria omnia cœlo*
> *miscuit,*"—

at the period, when in this country Popery achieved its first victory over the religious feelings of the people, the good sense of the cabinet, and the conscience of the king,—when in France a

mighty revolutionary wave deposited on the rock of power an ambitious prince, whom another and mightier wave has just swept down again and washed upon the shore of "perfidious," yet ever hospitable Albion,—then it was, that one of the most powerful minds that ever descended from the bleak hills of the lawless north into the cheery levels of the tamer south, prepared, with the rich compost of his imaginative thoughts and racy rantings, the mushroom-bed justly designated by the addition of an *ism* to his patronymic. A veritable son of Boreas was he,—the wildness and obliquity of his mental vision strangely and strikingly pourtrayed in the cast of his outer eye and countenance;—a giant among dwarfs he stood among the men of his generation, a Hercules among the pigmies of his kirk;—a man whom none that ever knew him ever could forget,—whom none ever can remember without reverence and love, without a tear of pity and a smile of ineffable reminiscence. In the very height of his too conscious strength one came upon him stronger than himself, and overcame him; the defeat was registered on high, and the decree went forth: "He that gathereth not with me, scattereth."

Such was the origin of the sect which seems destined in these latter days of the Christian dispensation to fill the place occupied in its first age, after the time of the Apostles, by the Montanists. The parallel is striking in more than one respect, as the sequel will show; and, among others, in the very *personnel* of the chief actors. Of the modern *Montanus*, the man from the northern hills, we have already spoken; whose snare was, like that of his prototype, "love of eminence," whereby, as the ancient author quoted by Eusebius affirms of the latter, "he gave place to the devil[1]." To say nothing of the Priscillas and Maximillas which this modern Montanism has in common with the Cataphrygian heresy, no one that has taken the trouble of perusing the work No. I, at the head of this article, will refuse to acknowledge that it has also found its Tertullian. For if it must be admitted that the modern Tertullian is not altogether as well-informed a man as his African original, it cannot be denied on the other hand that he is more than his equal in saturnine humour, in terseness and abruptness of style, in quaintness and occasional coarseness of thought, and in that curious and sometimes frivolous play of the imagination which not only sees in every thing a type and a *sacramentum*, but builds upon the most fanciful analogies and interpretations the ponderous structures of a theology, as deficient in soundness as it is abounding in ingenuity. But above all, that

[1] Ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ ψυχῆς ἀμέτρῳ φιλοπρωτείας δόντα πάροδον εἰς ἑαυτὸν τῷ ἀντικειμένῳ. Euseb. Hist. Eccles. l. v. c. 16.

which is the chief characteristic of Tertullian's Montanist compositions, the sovereign contempt which he deals to those who in his vocabulary rejoice in the appellation of *Psychics*, as distinguished from those that have the Spirit, is admirably reproduced by the oracle of the modern Montanist sect. "The knowledge and defence of Paraclete," says Tertullian, adverting to the difference between himself and the orthodox Church, "separated us subsequently from the Psychics[2]." "There is," says Mr. Drummond (p. 342), in speaking of every denomination of Christians, except his own sect, "an universal despising of the Holy Ghost as the Spirit of the body of Christ;" and this he accounts (p. 341) one of the points on which "all Christendom is equally infidel," so that in this respect "there is no essential difference in error between Roman and Protestant." The principle on which the whole work is composed, namely, that all the world is wrong, and no one knows or understands it, except Mr. Drummond, and those who have the advantage of his instruction, is laid down at the outset with a distinctness which does more credit to the candour than to the modesty of the writer.

"Whoever speaks, either upon religious or political subjects, must espouse the cause of one sect or another, unless he is prepared to submit to be charged with inconsistency. A partisan cannot afford to be just towards a rival party, without becoming liable to an accusation of treachery. *The Sovereign alone*, because he is *above all* political factions, can avail himself of the powers of all, for the purposes to which each is severally competent; and, *for the same reason*, can *the true Catholic alone* look upon Romanist and Protestant, High Church and Low Church disputants, according to their real values, and award to each the merit and the blame they deserve."—*Drummond, Substance of Lectures*, p. 1.

We will do Mr. Drummond the justice to say, that from a due regard, no doubt, to the benefit of those who are the melancholy theme of his discourse, and remembering how much more salutary censure is to most men than praise, he has been as chary of the latter as he is lavish of the former. A cynical discursive humour runs all through the book, which, if you are above getting angry, is rather entertaining than otherwise. If we had met with the volume without its title-page, and we had been asked to write one for it, without knowing any thing about the authorship, we should undoubtedly have written: "Mephistopheles his Walk through the Church Militant;" and possibly we might not have been far out. As it is, we would venture to suggest to Mr.

[2] *Nos postea agnitio Paracleti, atque defensio, disjunxit a Psychicis.* Tertull. adv. Prax. c. 1.

Drummond, that, in a future edition, the title should be altered, as thus: "Substance of Lectures fired off *at* the Churches;" for we have met with little in them that might serve for edification to those that are "within," while there is more than enough of castigation for "them that are without." We have some respect for a preacher who will take the bull of iniquity by the horns, and tell a sufficiency of unpalatable home truths concerning their own Church to his audience; but to descant upon the stupidity and the deadness of every other communion, upon an implied understanding that those whom he addresses have risen superior to all these defects and shortcomings, is to our apprehension not very profitable, though it is the most approved system of sectarian preaching. Nevertheless, let us not be ungrateful; *fas est et ab hoste doceri.* Much as we mislike the spirit of Mr. Drummond's book, and sorry as we should be to rely on such food for our edification, there are many things in his volume which are exceedingly true, and vastly well put; and for all that we have said, we are ready to admit this further point of resemblance between the two Tertullians, him of Carthage and him of Newman-street, that, as of the former old Cyprian used to say, "*Da magistrum,*" so the pages of the latter might furnish profitable "aids to reflection" even to a bishop.

There is another point of view, however, in which the book of Mr. Drummond is more instructive than he himself intended. When we had a large octavo volume brought under our notice, bearing the title, "Substance of Lectures delivered in the Churches," from the pen of him who, in those "Churches," occupies the high position of an "apostle," and more than an apostle, "the pillar of the apostles," we naturally supposed that it would contain a full development, if not of their discipline and worship, at least of their faith; and with that view we procured and perused it. But in this, as in many other respects, the "apostleship" of Newman-street bears witness against itself as an exceedingly bad imitation; and no mistake could be more grievous than that of supposing, as we confess we did in our simplicity, that in the pages of Mr. Drummond is to be found, after the manner of other "apostolic" writings, a key to the positive tenets of his "Church." If we except the few pages containing in twenty articles the *minimum* of faith which we are told must be common to all bodies of Christians "in union with the one Catholic Church," with bracketed glosses annexed to the several articles, and elsewhere an occasional allusion to certain "visions and revelations," the purport of which is not, however, suffered to transpire, or an allegorical delineation of the character of "the fourfold ministry," of all which more hereafter,—there is

literally nothing in Mr. Drummond's book to enlighten the reader as to the nature of Irvingism. This is the more surprising, as the Churches over which he presides are, in his opinion (p. 70), "places of refuge provided for the faithful,—who, like Lot of old, are dwelling in the mystic Sodom,"—during the impending destruction of all "the false systems," that is, of all the Churches and other Christian communions which were in the world before the rise of this modern Montanism.

"These Churches," we read in another place, "are necessarily without the oil, and never can have it; the cisterns, the pipes, and the vessels are all equally empty. Those Churches which hold the true hope, are still no better than unwise virgins, and must speedily *go to them who have the oil to sell*, or share their predicted fate. Now is the time of the end, when all these sayings of our Lord are fulfilled; now is the time for the lesson to be learned from the parable of the fig-tree,—a good tree, with healthy leaves, and in otherwise vigorous health, perhaps unusually productive of wood and leaves, but lacking the peculiar thing that was needed at the time. In the last days, when Christendom is rent into a thousand schisms, can be seen the union of all the different forms of outward Christianity, hitherto discordant, and still waging upon each other war to the knife, uniting, as in the eighty-third Psalm, against *the single thing which God is doing*, as a climax to all his former works."—*Substance of Lectures*, pp. 108, 109.

The abstract truth of the proposition that such will be the aspect of Christendom in the last days, we are, of course, far from denying; seeing it is written, "When the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth[3]?" What we call in question is, the assumption that the sect of which Mr. Drummond is "the pillar," is "the single thing which God is doing;" and although we can discern it to be a "climax," we have serious doubts of its being "the climax to all God's former works." We look in vain for any thing like evidence that the sect in Newman-street is "the stone cut out without hands," which shall break to pieces every Church and every other Christian communion: as Mr. Drummond has himself exhibited it, it is rather an unshapely pillar cut out, if no worse, by the hands of man, and raised aloft on the top of a heap of rubbish which he has raked together from all the Churches and sects of Christendom. It is rather an inauspicious way, for a system claiming to be the result of immediate revelation from heaven, to endeavour to establish its credit in the world, not by credentials in which the writing of the finger of God may be clearly discerned, such as the true Apostles of Christ adduced and appealed to as the warrant and evidence of their

[3] Luke xviii. 8.

mission, but by preferring charges, some true, some exaggerated, some utterly false, against every communion, being, or claiming to be, the congregation of Christ's people, on the face of the earth, and thereupon to argue,—"because you are all stale and unprofitable, therefore we are necessary; your systems are all false and rotten, therefore ours is the true system." What other or fitter answer is there to such logic and theology, but that of the patriarch of old: "No doubt but ye are the people, and wisdom shall die with you. But I have understanding as well as you; I am not inferior to you; yea, who knoweth not such things as these[4]?"

It is a pity, truly, that instead of hugging themselves as those which alone "have the oil to *sell*,"—which, by the way, the wise virgins refused to do when applied to by the foolish ones,—in the obscure seclusion of Newman-street, these deluded men and women,—well-meaning and earnest Christians many of them, we verily believe,—should not rather go forth among the members of that Church from which they have separated themselves, though they profess still to belong to it, and which they imagine to be plunged in such heathen darkness; because, if they did so, they might have some chance of learning, that the important truths which they fancy they are exclusively holding and setting forth, such as the reality of the Holy Ghost's indwelling in the Church, and the probable nearness of the second Advent, are preached and received by not a few among those whom they despise. They might then possibly come to understand what they are evidently ignorant of, that the option of rejecting those truths, or joining the sect in Newman-street, is by no means the only alternative left to a Christian man; that it is quite as possible, and a great deal more profitable, to hold those truths, and to proclaim them, in charity, humility, and sobriety, than to do so, Montanist fashion, in delusion, in spiritual pride, and separation.

In the absence of any truth distinguishing his communion from the existing Churches of Christ, and of any credentials distinguishing his followers from other fanatics or impostors which have risen up in the Church again and again with similar pretensions, it is vain for Mr. Drummond to expect that the mere *petitio principii* on his part, that his sect is the body of the elect to be gathered in the last days, and separated from the dross and refuse of universal Christendom, will be taken by serious and sober-minded Christians as a demonstration of the truth of the high mission to which he lays claim as "the pillar of the apostles" of a new dispensation: his declaration that, as men of old, "in

[4] Job xii. 2, 3.

rejecting the brazen serpent, rejected God," so now "in rejecting apostles," that is, Messrs. Drummond, Cardale, and consorts, "they reject the Holy Ghost," is a *brutum fulmen*, fit only to frighten those that are "weak in the faith," and to ensnare them in their "doubtful," and more than doubtful, "disputations." It were well, however, if the absence of any distinguishing truth, and of any credentials like those with which God has ever furnished his true apostles and prophets, were all the objection that lies against the sect in Newman-street. Unfortunately for them, there is not only the absence of distinguishing truth, but the presence of positive error; not only the want of credentials, but the lying pretence of such credentials; making it but too evident to the eye of spiritual discernment, that if there is, as they themselves allege, and as it seems difficult to deny, a supernatural work at the bottom of their system, it is no other than the snare of the devil, "transformed into an angel of light," and heralded to the world by "false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ [5]."

In saying this we desire to be understood as recording a deliberate conclusion arrived at upon satisfactory evidence; for we should hold it altogether inadmissible, especially on so solemn a subject, to quote a word of holy Scripture loosely, in the way of a rhetorical figure. We are unable, it is true, to speak from personal knowledge or experience; having,—on this very ground, that we had reason to believe the power manifested in the sect to be not a mere delusion of the human mind, but a supernatural and evil influence,—cautiously abstained from coming personally within the reach of those utterances; great as the temptation was to "come and see," especially at the first rise of the manifestations, when more than one unwary inquirer paid dearly for his pious curiosity. Among those who thus fell, for a time at least, under the power of the delusion, was Mr. Robert Baxter, the author of two pamphlets now lying before us, the date of which carries us back to the early days of Irvingism. The first of these, published in 1833, is entitled "Narrative of Facts, characterizing the Supernatural Manifestations in members of Mr. Irving's congregation, and other individuals, in England and Scotland, and formerly in the writer himself." The other pamphlet of Mr. Baxter, of which we have the second edition published in 1836, bears the title, "Irvingism, in its Rise, Progress, and present State." The subject of both is, as their titles indicate, substantially the same; but the former treats chiefly of the writer's own history while connected with the sect; the latter of the history, generally, of

[5] 2 Cor. xi. 13, 14.

the sect itself. A brief summary of the contents of both, with occasional extracts, will enable our readers to judge for themselves of the nature of the evidence upon which our conclusion, expressed above, is founded, and prepare the way for a more correct appreciation of the sect, as it is exhibited in its recent publications enumerated at the head of this article.

The utterances, it appears from Mr. Baxter's "Irvingism," began at Port Glasgow; their manner was "novel and appalling;" their matter was partly in plain English, on topics of prophecy; partly unintelligible, consisting of sounds which after many fruitless attempts to trace them in any known language, are now admitted to be different from any language spoken on the earth. The persons first gifted with the utterances were two brothers and several ladies, one of whom imported them into Mr. Irving's church in London, which was at that time the "National Scotch Church" in Regent-square. Mr. Irving, who looked upon his own congregation, tainted already by the unsound views he had propounded on the peccability of Christ's nature and the perfectibility of man, as upon a city on a hill in the midst of the darkness of surrounding Christendom, was not slow in acknowledging the utterances of his visiter from Port Glasgow as the fruits of a miraculous spiritual gift. After the female prophet from Glasgow had for some time associated with Mr. Irving's congregation, the infection spread, and three ladies began to "speak in the Spirit;" one of whom, however, after having been for months received as a prophetess, and her spiritual gifts fully recognized by the other prophets and prophetesses, acknowledged that she had on several occasions been "feigning utterances," and was accordingly declared "a false prophetess [6]." Hitherto no man had spoken as yet in this supernatural utterance in London; but it seems that "some movings towards utterance appeared" in a Mr. Taplin, and two of the prophetesses having been "much exercised in prayer that he might be made to speak," he accordingly "did speak in power in a tongue" (*i. e.* the unintelligible utterance) "and in English;" the former part of his utterance being afterwards "paraphrased" by one of the prophetesses.

All this took place at "private prayer meetings;" but Mr. Taplin followed up his private utterance by another at a public prayer meeting, again in what is technically termed by the sect "a tongue," and in English, in which language he ejaculated: "The Lord is at hand,—prepare to meet Him. The judgments are coming—judgments are around Him." The next step was

[6] Baxter, Narrative of Facts, pp. 93—95.

the exhibition of the utterances in the public Sunday congregation.

"It was at this time even the opinion of Mr. Irving and his personal friends, that these utterances, although of the Spirit of God, should not be allowed in the congregation when assembled for Divine service on the Lord's day. It was their judgment that it would be contrary to order and discipline. Some weeks elapsed after the utterances were permitted in the public prayer meetings, before they were heard in the Sunday congregation. On Sunday, the 16th of October, however, in the midst of the Morning Service, Miss H[7]." (the same who was afterwards pronounced a false prophetess) "was, as she expressed it, visited with such a power of the Spirit, that, unable to restrain her utterance, and yet unwilling to interrupt the service, she hastened from the body of the Church into the vestry, and there, in the hearing of the congregation, broke forth in an utterance, 'How dare ye to suppress the voice of the Lord;' and went on to set forth that these utterances, being the voice of the Lord, ought to be permitted in the congregation. Miss E. C., who followed her, also spoke in an utterance, saying the Spirit had been quenched and grieved by such prohibition, and warning them not to hinder it; for the Lord's voice ought to be heard in the Church. In the evening of the same day, Mr. Taplin spoke in a tongue in the congregation, and afterwards in English, 'Do you fly from the voice of God, when He is in the midst of you; where will ye flee in the day of judgment?'

"Thus were the utterances gradually introduced through Mr. Irving's congregation in London. They were often, in an extraordinary power of voice, accompanied by a most unnatural expression of countenance. It was on one occasion suggested by Mr. * * *" (subsequently one of the "apostles"), "soon after they were heard in the Sunday congregation, that those who spoke should endeavour to restrain its loudness. But he was immediately rebuked by an utterance from Miss H." (the false prophetess), "'Do you know what it is to have the word of God as a fire in your bones?' and going on to say it could not be restrained; which utterance was immediately confirmed by another from Miss E. C. 'It is so; it is so.' No further attempt was made to restrain them; but they continued with full permission to exercise their powers in the Sunday congregation. These utterances, from the period of their full recognition, took, as might be expected, the entire control. Mr. Irving, and the congregation which remained with him, bowed to them as the voice of God; and under the progress of these utterances the system of Irvingism has been fashioned."—*Baxter's Irvingism, &c.* pp. 18, 19.

Here, then, at the very threshold of this new "dispensation of the Spirit" we have the undeniable and remarkable fact that

[7] The names are given at full length in Mr. Baxter's second pamphlet.

the chief agent in causing these utterances to be produced in the public congregation, and in preventing any restraint from being imposed upon them, was one subsequently convicted and rejected as a "false prophetess," upon her own confession, and by the verdict of her sister-prophetesses, who "in power, pronounced that *the whole work in her was of the flesh, and not of the Lord*" (Narrative, p. 94); and the equally undeniable and remarkable fact, that the utterances of those who to this day lay claim to the spirit of true prophecy, accorded with the utterances of the "false prophetess," and set upon them the seal of confirmation. The same striking fact recurs in the case of Mr. Baxter himself, who was for several months reckoned a chief prophet among them, whose utterances were in perfect agreement with those of the other prophets and prophetesses, and who subsequently withdrew from the sect, and unequivocally declared the whole work to be of Satan; and that not upon being convicted as a false prophet like Miss H., but in consequence of the conviction spontaneously produced in his mind, by repeated failures of the prophecies, and by the false doctrine to which the utterances gave witness, that the work was not of God but of the devil.

Before we enter more fully into the account which Mr. Baxter gives of his own experience while under the delusion, it will not be uninteresting to compare with the facts above stated the account of a similar delusion which made its appearance in London at the beginning of the last century, and was of sufficient importance at the time, to call forth a violent attack upon it in William Whiston's Boyle Lectures. The library of Sion College contains five volumes of "Papers relating to the late false prophets, commonly called French[8] prophets;" and a full account of the rise and progress of the sect, of the corruptions into which it fell, and of its consequent downfall, was composed by Dr. Hughson[9], as late as the year 1814, chiefly from a book published at the time by one of the prophets themselves[1], whose eyes, like those of Mr. Baxter, were opened to the delusive character of the work. The purport of the prophecy of these "French prophets" was, as in the present instance, the imme-

[8] They are called "French" prophets, because the delusion was set on foot here by three Camisards, who, by laying on of hands, communicated "the power" by which they spoke, to others in this country.

[9] The title of this curious tract is: "A copious Account of the French and English prophets, who infested London during 1707 and the following years; the exhibition of some of them in the pillory, and a complete exposure of their infamous practices. By D. Hughson, LL.D., Editor of the History of London and other works. London, 1814."

[1] Under the title, "A Brand Snatched from the Burning; exemplified in the unparalleled case of Samuel Keimer." The writer afterwards turned Quaker.

diate approach of the second Advent. In a long apologetic manifesto, on the character of "the spirit," published by the prophets themselves against the attacks of "divines and others," many of whom did "own them to be actuated by a superior spirit," but declared that spirit to be "the spirit of the devil," the following curious passage occurs:—

"This spirit prepares and adorns the bride against the coming of the bridegroom. Without such a presence, and the extraordinary gifts and powers of the Spirit of God, neither the spreading and full establishing of the Gospel, nor the promised union of all nations into one faith and one law, nor the fulness of God's kingdom can ever be expected to be brought about. Its presence and immediate operations and gifts are necessary for the beginning of the conversion of man to God and His Christ. And now, when the harvest remains yet to be made (for what has been done hitherto is but an earnest), and when Christendom itself is deplorably hardened, misled, and divided, its immediate concurrence and manifestations are not less necessary, but rather more."—*Hughson's Copious Account*, p. 11.

Here we have the same demonstration of the *necessity* of this new dispensation, and on the same ground, the miserable state of Christendom, which we have already noticed in Mr. Drummond's book. The manner in which "the spirit" acted, was by violent and involuntary agitations with a loud roaring voice. "They are," says the manifesto (p. 5), "sometimes such as cannot at all be imitated; no, not by the persons themselves, out of inspiration." Keimer describes them (p. 18), as "very violent and strange agitations or shakings of the body," accompanied by "loud and terrifying hiccups and throbs;" in another place (p. 20), where he relates one of the inspiration scenes, he states that "between every two or three words speaking," the party under the influence of the power "cried, 'Hoh! hoh! hoh! hoh! O—h! o—h! o—h!' as if he were taking his last gasp;" and upon one occasion (p. 60) he mentions that "a prophetess roared out in so hideous a manner 'The devil! the devil! the devil!' that it terrified the believers themselves."

The parties that were caught in the snare of this delusion, were (p. 19) "generally persons that had made a serious profession of religion under the various denominations;" men who (p. 39) "in the sincerity of their hearts, were seeking the way to Sion, but through ignorance were enticed and prevailed upon by the voice of the deluder;" several of them "being men of distinguished sense and judgment in natural things, as well as substance." In the catalogue of the principal characters (pp. 77—81) appended to the narrative, are mentioned the names of Sir Richard

Bulkely, Lady Jane Forbes, a Mr. Everard, who was Envoy from the British Court to France, and various other persons of a respectable condition in life, as lawyers, physicians, merchants, &c. There was also among them a clergyman of the name of Foster, a prebendary of Sarum, who publicly in the pulpit professed his belief in the manifestations, in consequence of which he was suspended for six months by Bishop Burnet. Among the prophetesses one Anne Topham was chiefly conspicuous, who went by the *sobriquet* "the bishop," on account of "the orders for meetings and missions coming so often through her mouth;" notwithstanding which she was subsequently turned out of the sect.

The gross fleshly sins into which the prophets at last fell, and that under the express direction of "the spirit," finally revealed the real origin and character of their inspiration; but long before this took place, there were indications that it was a lying spirit that spoke in them, quite sufficient to have undeceived the "believers," but for the extraordinary subtilty of the spirit in turning aside difficulties, and devising evasive pleas, and the still more extraordinary blindness by which the minds of its deluded followers were overcast. The most definite and explicit prophecies ended in failure and disappointment; and the occasional strangeness of the commands given by "the spirit," created much perplexity, and excited suspicions, more than once. But they had been taught by the spirit (p. 67) that "true saving faith consisted in an implicit belief in, and strict obedience to whatsoever that spirit commanded, without consulting their reason, or having regard to the commands of God as revealed in Scripture;" and when, upon one occasion (p. 58), one of the prophetesses was unwilling to go, at the bidding of the spirit, and pronounce a sick man whole, because she had been so often disappointed, "the spirit, through her own mouth, severely reproved and threatened her." As she still resisted, "the spirit" came upon one of the prophets very violently, and "terribly reproved and threatened her for her disobedience, commanding her still to obey, which she, with the greatest reluctance possible, at last did, by going to the sick man, under violent agitations, and pronouncing him whole." The sick man, however, died shortly after; as another of the sect, Dr. Emes, had done before under similar circumstances. On many other occasions, detailed by Keimer, the most explicit prophecies came to nothing when the time fixed for their fulfilment arrived; yet the delusion retained its hold upon the members of the sect.

"Though in every thing we found ourselves disappointed," Keimer continues, "yet so deeply rooted were we in this delusion, that all the

reason, solid arguments, and plain Scriptures that were brought by our friends, to convince us of our grand mistake, proved ineffectual."—*Hughson's Copious Account*, pp. 47, 48.

And again, further on:

"The many failures which had come from the mouths of the inspired, and many of a public nature, began to give some people a little uneasiness, fearing they were not of God. Upon which, Nicholas Facio, a great mathematician, a member of the Royal Society, and one, as it is said, who understands well to speak and write fifty-two languages, writes a very cunning and subtile exposition on the 22nd verse of the 18th chapter of Deuteronomy, viz. 'When a prophet speaketh in the name of the Lord, if the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that is the thing which the Lord hath not spoken, but the prophet hath spoken it presumptuously: thou shalt not be afraid of him.' This exposition was so cunningly made, that I now verily believe, had twenty Jesuits joined together to consult, they could not have given a more clever turn to overthrow the meaning of so clear a text, as this Facio did. His exposition was handed about amongst believers, and, I think, not without its intended success."—*Hughson's Copious Account*, pp. 49, 50.

We now turn to the description which Mr. Baxter gives of that power of which he was, for a time, the subject, and of the circumstances by which he was afterwards led to the conclusion, that the spirit which spake in him was a lying spirit. His attention, it appears, had been directed to the question of spiritual gifts; and he had been led to think favourably of the manifestations which had recently commenced in London, before he came into personal contact with any of the parties. The following is his own account of his first attendance at one of the private prayer meetings at which, at that period, none but the gifted persons, or persons anxious to obtain the gift, were permitted to be present.

"Having obtained an introduction, I attended; my mind fully convinced that the power was of God, and prepared, as such, to listen to the utterances. After one or two brethren had read and prayed, Mr. T— (Taplin) was made to speak two or three words very distinctly, and with an energy and depth of tone which seemed to me extraordinary, and it fell upon me as a supernatural utterance, which I ascribed to the power of God; the words were in a tongue I did not understand. In a few minutes Miss E. C. broke out in an utterance in English, which, as to matter and manner, and the influence it had upon me, I at once bowed to as the utterance of the Spirit of God. Those who have heard the powerful and commanding utterance need no description; but they who have not, may conceive, what an unnatural and unaccustomed tone of voice, an intense and riveting power of expression—with the declaration of a cutting rebuke to all who were present, and applicable to my own state of mind in particular—would effect upon me, and upon the others who were come together, expecting to hear the voice of the Spirit

of God. In the midst of the feeling of awe and reverence which this produced, I was myself seized upon by the power; and in much struggling against it, was made to cry out, and myself to give forth a confession of my own sin in the matter for which we were rebuked; and afterwards to utter a prophecy that the messengers of the Lord should go forth, publishing to the ends of the earth in the mighty power of God, the testimony of the near coming of the Lord Jesus. The rebuke had been for not declaring the near coming of Jesus; and I was smitten in conscience, having many times refrained from speaking of it to the people, under a fear they might stumble over it, and be offended."—*Baxter's Narrative*, pp. 4, 5.

The last allusion to what Mr. Baxter conceived to be his sin in this matter, refers to his practice of privately teaching the poor in the parish in which he resided. With regard to the testimony borne by the utterance to the Lord Jesus, it should not be forgotten, that the devils were among the first to bear witness to the Lord at His first coming [2], and that one of the most explicit testimonies to the truth of the Gospel was that of the damsel at Philippi, who was possessed with a spirit of divination [3]. But to return to Mr. Baxter, and the effect which "the power" produced upon him. Speaking of a subsequent occasion, he says,

"Suddenly the power came down upon me, and I found myself lifted up in soul to God, my wandering thoughts at once riveted, and calmness of mind given me. By a constraint I cannot describe, I was made to speak—at the same time shrinking from utterance, and yet rejoicing in it. The utterance was a prayer that the Lord would have mercy upon me and deliver me from fleshly weakness, and would graciously bestow upon me the gifts of His Spirit, 'the gift of wisdom, the gift of knowledge, the gift of faith, the working of miracles, the gifts of healing, the gift of prophecy, the gift of tongues, and the interpretation of tongues; and that he would open my mouth and give me strength to declare his glory.' This prayer, short almost as I have now penned it, was forced from me by the constraint of the power which acted upon me; and the utterance was so loud, that I put my handkerchief to my mouth to stop the sound that I might not alarm the house. When I had reached the last word I have written, the power died off me, and I was left just as before, save in amazement at what had passed, and filled, as it seemed to me, with thankfulness to God for His great love so manifested to me. With the power there came upon me a strong conviction—'This is the Spirit of God; what you are now praying is of the Spirit of God, and must, therefore, be the mind of God; and what you are asking, will surely be given to you.' This conviction—strong as it was at the moment—was never shaken, until the whole work fell to pieces. But from that day I acted in the full assurance that in God's

[2] Mark iii. 11. Luke iv. 34. 41. [3] Acts xvi. 16—18.

own good time all these gifts would be bestowed upon me."—*Baxter's Narrative*, pp. 8, 9.

In this conviction Mr. Baxter was confirmed by the testimony of the other prophets and prophetesses, not only by the agreement of their utterance with his own on many occasions, but by the voice of prophecy in them, pointing him out as one of the chiefest instruments of the Lord in this new dispensation. To mention but one instance which occurred immediately after a most painful scene, of which a casual visiter was the object:

"As I passed Mrs. C." (one of the prophetesses) "I took her hand to shake hands with her, when the power came upon her, and, holding my hand, she addressed me before all the company; beginning, by setting out Jesus Christ, and proceeding, as the prophet of Christ, to declare that Jesus had sent His angel, and touched my lips with a living coal not many days past; that the word of the Lord proceeded from my lips, and I was a prophet, and more than a prophet, for I should speak with authority; that I was a chosen stone in the temple of the Lord; but warning the people not to rest in the vessel, for though I was a chief stone, yet I was not *the* chief corner-stone."—*Baxter's Narrative*, p. 73.

While a personal belief in the power from which these utterances proceeded, was thus insinuated into the mind through the subtlest of all the channels of mischief, spiritual pride, and love of distinction, failures which must, we should have thought, have removed the delusion at once, and drawn attention to its real character, were of constant occurrence. The following may serve as a specimen:

"After breakfast, when sitting with Mr. Irving, Mr. P., and a few others, Mr. Irving remarked that Mr. T., when in the Court of Chancery, had found the power mightily upon him, but never a distinct impulse to utterance. Whilst he was speaking on it, I was made in power to declare, 'There go I, and thence to the prison-house.' This was followed by a prophecy setting forth the darkness of the visible church, referring to the king as the head of the Church of England, and to the chancellor as the keeper of the conscience of the king. That a testimony should that day be borne before him which should make the nation tremble at what was coming to pass. That I was to go and bear this testimony, and for the testimony should be cast into prison. That the abomination of desolation would be set up in the land, and Satan sit in the high places of the Church, showing himself to be God. That the world had now the possession of the visible church, but for the purity of doctrine of the Church of England, she, as the last portion of the visible church, had been accounted holy by the Lord; but she had gone on in worldly cares, and was now so provoking the Lord, and by worldly-mindedness so quenching the Spirit of God, that

God had cast her off. That it was necessary a spiritual minister should bear testimony before the conscience-keeper of the head of this church, and then the abomination of desolation would be set up, and every man must flee to the mountains. Much was added of the judgments of God in the midst of the land. The power upon me was overwhelming. I gave all present a solemn benediction, as though I was departing altogether from among them, and forbidding Mr. Irving, who rose to speak to me as I was going, I went out under the constraint of the power, and shaped my way to the court of the chancellor, to bear the testimony to which I was commanded.

"As I went on towards the court, the sufferings and trials I underwent were almost beyond endurance. Might it not be a delusion? Ought I not to consider my own character in the sight of the world, which would be forfeited by such an act; and the ruin of all worldly prospects, which would ensue from it, and from my imprisonment? These and a thousand more subtle and trying suggestions were cast in upon me; but confident that the power speaking in me was of God, it seemed my duty to obey at every sacrifice; and without counting the cost, I gave myself up to God to do with me and use me as He should see fit. In this mind I went on, expecting, as I entered the court of the chancellor, the power would come upon me, and I should be made to bear testimony before him. I knew not what I was to say, but supposed, that, as on all other occasions, the subject and utterance would be together given. When I entered, no power came on me. I stood in the court before the chancellor for three or four hours, momentarily expecting the power to come upon me, and as the time lengthened, more and more perplexed at its absence. I was tempted to speak in my own strength without the power; but I judged this would not be faithful to the word spoken, as my testimony would not have been in the Spirit. After waiting this time I came out of court, convinced there was nothing for me to say.

"The mental conflict was most painful. I left the court under the conviction I had been deluded. If I were deluded, how was it with the others who spoke in the power, one of whom had borne direct testimony to my utterance being of God; and the others of whom had received me, and heard me, and spoken in power with me, as one of them? Here, however, I failed; I adjudged myself deceived, but I had not sufficient proof, as I thought, to sit in judgment upon them. I thought I had stumbled, but I dared not condemn them. I went at once to Mr. Irving, who, anxious as to the issue of my mission, welcomed me as delivered from prison. I said to him, 'We are snared —we are deceived; I had no message before the chancellor.' He inquired particulars, but could give no solution. He said, 'We must wait. You certainly have received the gift; and the gifts and calling of God are without repentance.' We set ourselves to search whether in any thing I had mistaken the directions of the power, but could not discover it. I observed to him, 'If the work in me is of the enemy, what will you say of the rest who have so joined me, and borne

witness of me?' 'True,' said he, 'but their's has been tried in every way.' He then mentioned the trials. . . .

"Deeply was I troubled and perplexed, and much was I humbled before God. But my eyes not being opened fully to see that the whole work must stand or fall together; and not being instructed, as I have since most painfully been, of the subtlety and cunning craftiness of the enemy; my prayers were yet made in a confidence that a work of God was in the midst of us, and my doubts were of my own individual gift. In the morning I attended the prayer-meeting, though so much burdened as not to be able to lift up my heart among them. An utterance came from Miss E. C.; 'It is discernment—it is discernment ye lack: seek ye for it—seek ye for it;' and going on in the same strain, setting forth the love and faithfulness of God. I believe she knew nothing of the issue of the visit to the chancellor; but, be that as it may, the message impressed me as though it applied to my case, and I was led to think lack of discernment would be found to have occasioned my stumbling. However, my heaviness was not removed until after the meeting, when, at breakfast, the subject was alluded to, and the text in Jeremiah was quoted—where it is said, 'Thou hast deceived me, and I was deceived. Then said I, I will not speak the word of the Lord any more; but the word of the Lord was unto me as a fire in my bones.' When I had read this, and was thinking upon it, the power came upon me, and I was made to say, 'The word of the Lord is as fire, and if ye, O vessel! who speak, refuse to obey the word, ye shall utterly perish—ye have obeyed the word of the Lord—ye went to the place of testimony—the Spirit was quenched before the conscience of the King—ye, a spiritual minister, have borne witness there; and were ye not cast into prison? has not the dark dungeon been your prison-house since ye came from the place of testimony? Ye lack discernment:—ye must read the word spiritually—the abomination of desolation is set up—the Spirit of God is quenched in all the churches of the land; and now the mystical Man of Sin is enthroned, and sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God.'—Then followed a command to flee to the mountains—to come out of Babylon and be separate; and much more concerning the Lord's work and the duty of His people.—This acted like electricity. I thought, and those who had heard the message of the former morning thought with me, that read spiritually, in which way I ought to have read it, the message concerning the chancellor had been fulfilled by my silent testimony, and my subsequent darkness and bondage. My satisfaction was complete: the explanation seemed then to me quite satisfactory; though now, I confess, it seems to me but a deep subtlety for explaining away a manifest failure of the word."—*Baxter's Narrative*, pp. 24—28.

It is almost incredible that so shallow a subterfuge should have availed to silence the doubts of a rational mind; nor can it be accounted for on any other principle than that assigned by Mr.

Baxter himself, namely, that "if we put ourselves under the power of the enemy, by giving heed to seducing spirits," the result is, that "our eyes are blinded, and our minds darkened by him, until we are both blind and foolish beyond belief." Another and most startling instance of the power of the delusion is thus related:

"At the close of the meeting, a scene occurred which baffles all description, and on which, whenever I now think, the deepest feelings of horror and shame creep over me. Mrs. C. was made, after our exposition was concluded, to cry out in a most piercing utterance, that there was some one in the midst of us who was provoking the Lord by jealousy, envy, and hard thoughts of His servants the prophets. Regarding this, as we all did, as the Spirit of God, every one was cast back in examination of his own thoughts; and, as the gift of prophecy was a general object of desire, many tender consciences converted their admiration of, and longing after, the gift, into an envy and provocation. A feeling of dismay seemed to run through the company, but no one answered. The accusation was reiterated, with a demand that the person should step forward, and confess. Many present, one after another, came forward, and, confessing some sin, inquired if they were any of them the culprit. None of these, however, were recognized as such. The cry again went forth, and my voice was mingled with Mrs. C.'s, declaring the person who was meant was conscious of it. The agony expressed on many countenances was intense; one man was so overcome, that his head fell on the chair, as though he were paralyzed, uttering an unnatural moaning cry, which showed the intensity of his mental agony. I was made in power to pray the Lord to discover the offender, and ease the consciences of His children. But after some time spent in this state, seeing the person was not found, we prepared to go home."—*Baxter's Narrative*, pp. 72, 73.

Then followed the scene already referred to[4], in which Mr. Baxter was acknowledged by the prophetess who had first given utterance to the denunciation, as "a chief stone," though "not *the* chief corner-stone." After relating the substance of her prophecy concerning him, Mr. Baxter thus resumes the narrative of the circumstances connected with the denunciation.

"When she had concluded, I turned round to Mr. Irving, intending to ask all present to kneel down to pray, when Mr. Irving silently pointed to a person who stood by, and looking to him I saw a power resting upon him, and he struggling to give utterance. I paused, and when utterance broke from him, instead of articulate words, nothing but muttering followed, and with this an expression of countenance most revolting. Lifting up a prayer to God to judge His own cause, and preserve us from judging unjustly of a brother; almost at the same

[4] See above, p. 27.

moment an utterance broke from Mrs. C., and from myself; 'It is an evil spirit.' A thrill of horror passed through the company, and presently an utterance came from Mrs. C.—'Rebuke the unclean spirit, and command him to enter no more into him.' The power came upon me, and I said, 'In the name of Jesus, I adjure thee, thou foul spirit, to come out of the man, and enter no more into him.' The man, however, continued muttering and speaking nonsense. Again the command came from Mrs. C., and the power upon me, and I used the same words over him again. Lady ——, who was present, and had before once or twice spoken in the power, under an impulse of the power, rose up, and stretching her hands towards me, cried out in power, 'Greater is he that is in you, than he that is in the world;' and repeating this several times, sank down on the floor. We all paused. The muttering and disgusting utterances continued. Mr. Irving suggested, 'This kind goeth not forth but with prayer and fasting.' We were, however, confounded, and the only explication I could suggest, was, that the word of God had gone forth for the expulsion of the evil spirit, and we must rest in faith, that in due time the effect would follow, and the man be delivered."—*Baxter's Narrative*, p. 74.

It is hardly necessary to point out what must at once suggest itself to every reflecting mind, that however satisfactory the explanation attempted by Mr. Irving might have been, if parties usually endowed with the power of casting out evil spirits, had *of their own mere motion* endeavoured to exercise that power in any particular case, and had been unsuccessful, it is wholly insufficient to account for the failure, when the attempt to cast out what had been declared by the voice of this supernatural utterance to be "an evil spirit," was made by the express command of the same supernatural utterance speaking through one person, and in the power of that utterance speaking through another; and not only so, but when both the command and the attempt were repeated, and still it continued a failure. A curious contrast to this abortive exorcism is furnished by a case of successful exorcism used against this "power" itself, which, though not connected with Mr. Baxter's personal narrative, is yet related by him, as throwing great light upon the whole subject:

"In the latter end of the past year [*i.e.* 1832], two children of a pious and exemplary clergyman in Gloucestershire, had been made to speak by a supernatural power. They were twins, a boy and a girl, and only eight or nine years of age; children in whom nothing of a religious turn had been remarked. Their parents were, unfortunately, led to seek after the manifestations, believing them to be of the Spirit of God. From the time the mouths of the children were opened, their conduct seemed so much changed, that they appeared most religious and devoted children. Their utterance was most astounding; beginning in the setting

forth of Jesus, and calling to self-abasement before His cross; and proceeding with such recital of Scripture, and such power of argument and exhortation, as might be said to surpass many able ministers, and certainly quite out of the compass of children of their age and understanding. Having, by this demonstration of power, of truth and holiness, gained the confidence of their parents and friends, they were carried on to deliver prophecies of things which were coming to pass—then uttering commands to their parents and friends, and sending them here and there—denouncing the judgments of God upon the church and world, and setting a day for a particular manifestation of judgment.—Shortly things were spoken by them which seemed to their parents contrary to Scripture, and they were startled by an utterance forbidding to marry. This was so plainly the work of a false spirit, that their parents and friends were greatly distressed; and, though much awed by the influence which the power had obtained over them, they remembered they had forgotten the command, 'Try the spirits;' and they wished to try the spirit in the children by the Scripture test. They accordingly called the boy, and told him their doubts, and that they must try the spirit. The boy seemed to be much wrought upon by the power, and in the supernatural utterance said, 'Ye may try the spirits in men, but ye may not try the spirits in children. Ye will surely be punished.' They, however, persisted; though the father was so much agitated, as not to be able to do it; yet the curate addressed the spirit in the child, and demanded, in the words of Scripture, a confession that Christ was come in the flesh. Paleness and agitation increased over the child, till an utterance broke from him, 'I will never confess it.' They were thus satisfied that it was an evil power which spoke in him, and the curate went on to say, 'I command thee, thou false spirit, in the name of Jesus, to come out of the child.' As the child afterwards described his feelings, he felt as though a coldness were removed from his heart, and passed away from him. They told the child, if he felt the power coming on him again, to resist it, and several times he did so. Once, some time afterwards, from his mistaking something his parents had said to him, to be a direction to yield to the power, if it should again come on him, he did yield to it, and spoke supernaturally as before; but being corrected, and thenceforth resisting the power whenever it came upon him, he was entirely freed from it. This narrative, which I first saw in print, has been confirmed to me by one who was an eye and ear witness of the whole. If any one should be inclined to doubt whether any supernatural agency has been manifested in the adults, and should be led to think excitement, coupled with a fervid imagination, is sufficient to account for all that has occurred in them; he will yet be compelled to acknowledge, that in these children, at least, neither excitement nor imagination can account for it."—*Baxter's Narrative*, pp. 97, 98.

To Mr. Baxter's voucher for the truth of this story, on the evidence of an eye and ear witness, we can add our own testimony;

having had the whole transaction, with many more circumstances of detail, communicated to us by a clergyman who was personally acquainted with both the father of the children, and with his curate, and had received his information from their own lips.

From these illustrations of the character of the supernatural power by which the Irvingite sect is held captive, we now turn to those particular points which led Mr. Baxter to the conclusion that the whole work was of Satan, and which are at the same time of considerable importance in determining the present character and position of the sect. These points refer partly to doctrine, and partly to Church order; in both which considerable innovations were brought in under the influence of "the utterances." With regard to doctrine, the principal point is the erroneous view taken by Mr. Irving of the flesh of our blessed Lord, a view which of itself is sufficient to show, that the spirit from which these utterances proceed, is not of God. The nature of the error itself, and the extent to which the character of the utterance, and consequently that of the whole sect, are involved in it, will be best gathered from Mr. Baxter's account of what took place between him and Mr. Irving on the subject. Mr. Baxter, who was at that time in the country, had, it seems, had his doubts as to Mr. Irving's soundness, in consequence of which he was moved to write to him "in power." Before Mr. Irving had time to answer, Mr. Baxter had two passages in Mr. Irving's book on the Human Nature of Christ pointed out to him by a clergyman, a friend of his, which could leave no doubt as to what Mr. Irving really taught. The passages were as follows:

"And in the face of all these certainties, if a man will say that His (Christ's) flesh was not *sinful flesh as ours is*, with *the same dispositions*, and *propensities*, and wants, and afflictions, then, I say, *God hath sent that man strong delusions that he should believe a lie*." ("Human Nature, &c. p. 23.")—*Baxter's Narrative*, p. 101.

"Now if there had not been in Christ's nature *appetites*, *ambitions*, and *spiritual darkenings*, how, I ask, could the devil have addressed these several temptations to his will?" ("Human Nature, p. 24.")—*Baxter's Narrative*, p. 101.

The reading of these passages drew from Mr. Baxter, in the presence of his friend, "an utterance in power" to this effect, "He has erred, he has erred." Confirmed by this utterance in his own view of the holiness of Christ's human nature, Mr. Baxter, after some further investigation of Mr. Irving's writings, which discovered to him his further unsoundness in regard to the holiness of believers, addressed to Mr. Irving a second letter.

"In much heaviness, I sat down to write to Mr. Irving, stating fully his error in conceiving the law of sin to be in the flesh of Jesus;

and stating also what I conceived to be the truth concerning our holiness. That as by faith accepted in Christ and clothed in His righteousness, so we are in the sight of the Father holy and without blame. But whilst in the flesh, the law of sin remains even in them who are regenerate, and the flesh lusteth against the Spirit. And though our mark and aim should be, to 'be perfect even as our Father is perfect;' yet that we all come short of perfect holiness in the flesh, and are unprofitable servants.—As Mr. Irving regarded me destined to the apostolic office, and set for the instruction of his Church, I had great confidence that he would receive this, and would be led to retract and abandon his errors, and thus remove a great stumbling-block from his door."—*Baxter's Narrative*, p. 102.

The result was, after a few days, a letter from Mr. Irving, which Mr. Baxter gives in full, on the ground that it was mainly instrumental in opening his eyes to the delusion by which he and others were bound, and which, as an authentic document, not only of the tenets of the sect, but of the fact that the alleged inspiration of the sect bears testimony to those tenets, we think it useful to place permanently on record:

"*London*, 21*st April*, 1832.

"My dear Brother,—Read this letter with your eye on God.—We have great need, especially the spiritual amongst us, to walk humbly with the Lord. Your first letter, containing the utterance of the Spirit, without any expression of his intention in sending it to me, led me very deeply to ponder the subject of our Lord's flesh, and to cry upon the Lord to examine me; and to the same exercise of soul had I been drawn by the utterance of the Spirit, and the experience of the spiritual of my flock in these days past. These things put me into a fit condition for receiving the full impression of your last letter, which arrived last night, after I had preached a sermon on the Holy Generation of the Flesh of Christ. This I had done, in order to express anew, before my people, with all caution and consideration, what I firmly believe to be the truth; and to guard them against the effect of any rash and unguarded expressions which I might at any time have used. All night long, my soul, sleeping and waking, was exercised upon the subject of your last letter. And it being wonderfully ordered in God's providence, that Mrs. C. should be in town for a day or two; and that Miss E. C., though desirous to go home before breakfast, was so burdened as not to be able to go: these two prophetesses of the Lord, who have been His mouth of wisdom and of warning to me and my church in all perplexities; I called along with my wife, who had read your letter and read it to me, and having spread the whole matter before the Lord, and twice besought His presence, we proceeded to read your letters in order.—Upon your first letter, there was no utterance of the Spirit, nor expression of any kind amongst us, but that of assent.—When we had read the two first pages of the second, wherein you reason upon the words of the Spirit, 'He has erred, he has erred,' given

to you upon two sentences of my book; and bring forward your views of our Lord's flesh, and of the believer's holiness, in contra-distinction from mine—we paused; and seeing there was so manifest a discrepancy between us, I solemnly besought the Lord that He would speak His own mind in the matter. Instantly the Spirit came upon Miss E. C., and after speaking in a very grieved tone and spirit in a tongue, she was made to declare many words which I will not take upon me to attempt to repeat, seeing the Spirit hath discountenanced such attempts. But the substance was most precisely this—that you had been snared by departing from the word and the testimony—that I had maintained the truth, and the Lord was well pleased with me for it—that I must not flinch now, but be more bold for it than heretofore—that He had honoured me for it, and I must not draw back—that in some words I had erred, and that the word of the Spirit by you was therefore true,—and that if I waited upon the Lord, He would show them me by His Spirit, but that He had forgiven it because He knew that my heart was right towards Him—that I had maintained the truth and must not draw back from maintaining it. Thereupon we knelt down, and having confessed my sin, and thanked Him for His mercy, I proceeded to entreat Him for you, that you might be delivered from the snare in which you were taken concerning the flesh of Christ and the holiness of the believer. This done, I sought to recover and recount the substance of the utterance as above given, that by their help I might report it to you exactly. My wife was mentioning a doubt, whether it should not simply be left to the Lord, and not dealt with in the understanding at all; seeing that in your letter you had gone astray by commenting in your own understanding on the words of the Spirit, 'He hath erred,' as applicable to two sentences of my book, and applied them to my whole doctrine, which the Spirit had just declared to be 'the truth,' that 'must be maintained:' when Mrs. C. was made to speak in a tongue with great authority and strength, and immediately after in English, to the effect, that you had stumbled greatly by bringing your own carnal understanding to spiritual things—that truth in the inward parts, the law of God in the heart, wrought in us the fulfilment of the righteousness of the law in all our members; and that union with Jesus brought into us the holiness of Jesus in body, soul, and spirit—that the Lord would have a church upon the earth, holy as He is holy; the light of the world as He is the light of the world—that some had sought to bring this about in the flesh—that you had been snared in the opposite extreme of denying it altogether, and making a distinction between Christ's holiness and that of His Church—that you must be informed of it, because this it was which was preventing the work of the Lord. There was a third utterance through Miss E. C. to teach me that Satan sought to overthrow my confidence in the truth, and to bring me into a snare, but that I was called upon to maintain it now more firmly than ever.

"There were no more utterances; but when we came to that part of your letter where you say, 'Concerning the vessels by whom He

speaks, you have fearfully provoked Him, and they are ready to burst asunder under your hands[5]. There was great indignation felt by both the vessels of the Lord present, and great sense of injustice felt by myself. For, oh! dear brother, I have done all things to know and follow the mind of the Lord in respect of them. It was indeed said, I think in the Spirit, that this in you was the same Spirit of 'the accuser of the brethren,' which hath manifested itself lately amongst us in one of the gifted persons who spoke evil of me in the midst of the congregation. But the Lord hath showed him that though it was with power, the power was not from God but from Satan, to whom, by hard and unjust thoughts of me, he had opened the door. Ah! dear brother, you have surely been much overseen in some way or other—search it out. The thing you spoke of F. and of Miss H., was not of God. I fear, and am persuaded in my own mind, that you have not discriminated duly, what is of God and what is not of Him; and that sin in this matter, undiscerned and unconfessed, hath brought on greater falls, as we have seen amongst ourselves; and that now you are brought to oppose that very doctrine which alone can bring the church to be meet for her bridegroom:—that as He was holy in the flesh, so are we, through the grace of regeneration, brought to be holy—planted in a holy standing—the flesh dead to sin, as His flesh was dead to sin—and that by the baptism of the Holy Ghost we are brought into the fellowship of His power and fulness, to do the works which He also did, and greater works than these.

"When we came to that passage of your letter where you censure as 'fearfully erroneous' a passage in the Day of Pentecost[6], we were all made to feel that you were forgetting what you yourself had been made to utter so abundantly concerning the baptism with fire and the spiritual ministry.

"I have read this to my wife, and Mrs. C., and Miss E. C., and they say it is a full and exact account.

"And now, upon the whole, my well-beloved brother and prophet of the Lord, I give you counsel to search and prove what it is that sits so heavy upon your conscience, for the Lord will surely reveal it. Concerning the flesh of Christ, we will discourse when we meet. I believe it to have been no better than other flesh, as to its passive qualities or properties, as a creature thing. But that the power of the Son of God,

[5] This Mr. Baxter explains in a note, by stating that the passage "was written under the dictation of the power; and the impression on my mind was, that he had too much honoured me and the other persons speaking in the power, and so had dishonoured God. He, and those with him, evidently read it as though I accused him of behaving ill towards one or more of the speakers. The very opposite of what I intended."

[6] "This passage," says Mr. Baxter, in a note, "is the one (p. 39) in which he asserts, 'Baptism of the Holy Ghost doth bring to every believer the presence of the Father, and the power of the Holy Ghost, according to that measure, at the least, in which Christ, during the days of His flesh, possessed the same.' I had myself received what they all held to be the Baptism of the Holy Ghost, and could therefore testify practically as well as doctrinally."

as Son of man in it, believing in the Father, did for His obedience to become Son of man, receive such a measure of the Holy Ghost as sufficed to resist its own proclivity to the world and to Satan, and to make it obedient unto God in all things: which measure of the Spirit He received in his generation, and so had holy flesh; and by exercise of the same faith, He kept His vineyard holy, and presented it holy to the great Husbandman. Regeneration, through faith, sealed in baptism, doth give to us the same measure of the Spirit to do the same work of making our flesh the holy thing, the temple of the Holy Ghost, body, soul, and spirit holy—wherefore we have the name, 'saints,' or 'holy ones,' 'sons of God,' as He received those names in virtue of his generation of the Holy Ghost. If we were to meet, I think we would not find much difference of mind as to the flesh of Christ. But as to your view of holiness, it is the very deepest, and darkest, and subtlest snare of the enemy. If you understood thoroughly the one subject, you would understand thoroughly the other. I say not that Christ had the motions of the flesh, but that the law of the flesh was there all present: but that whereas in us it is set on fire by an evil life, in Him it was, by a holy life, put down, and His flesh brought to be a holy altar, whereon the sacrifices and offerings for the sin of the world, and the whole burnt-offerings of sorrow, and confession, and penitence for others, might ever be offered up. And thus ought we to be, and shall be, when the flesh becometh the sackcloth covering [7].

"Oh! brother, I have had many trials, but the Lord hath sustained me, and I dwell before Him in peace of soul, though in much sorrow, because of the condition of His Church. I shall be glad when we meet. But, oh! I beeeech you, lay to heart the words which have been spoken by the Spirit, and doubt any words which may be spoken in you contrary thereto. For though an angel from heaven should come to me, testifying to your views of holiness, I would not receive him.

"Do you hold correspondence with any of my flock, that you should speak so positively, yet so unjustly, concerning my treatment of the spiritual persons? or is there some meaning couched under it which I do not understand? Did the Spirit say so in you? If so, doubt that spirit; for certainly it is not true, they themselves being witnesses.

"Fare you well. May the Lord have you in His holy keeping. Amen.

"Your faithful brother,

"Edwd. Irving."

(*Baxter's Narrative*, pp. 103—108.)

This letter, Mr. Baxter says, was "a great blow" to him; and it is unquestionably a great blow to the character of the whole

[7] This Mr. Baxter explains to be an "allusion to Rev. xi., where the sackcloth covering of the witnesses is spoken of. Mrs. C. had been made to prophesy that the baptism by fire would burn out the carnal mind, and our flesh would then become a sackcloth covering, the clothing of the witnesses, and this is what Mr. Irving was looking forward to."

work. While in reference to the utterance, "He has erred, he has erred," the utterance of "the prophetesses" acknowledged that "the word of the Spirit by Mr. Baxter was true," the same utterance virtually cancelled the admission so extorted, by the miserable subterfuge of censuring Mr. Baxter for "commenting in his own understanding on the words of the Spirit," and by the re-assertion of the substantial truth of Mr. Irving's doctrine on the human nature of Christ as the distinctive truth to be brought out by this new "dispensation of the Spirit." There is no need, in order to establish the fearfully erroneous character of that doctrine, to insist upon the two passages admitted by "the utterance" to be erroneously expressed; this very letter of Mr. Irving, written upon "the Spirit's" express declaration of "the truth" to be "maintained more firmly than ever," contains abundant affirmation of the heresy against which Mr. Baxter contended. To make "a distinction between Christ's holiness and that of His Church," is unequivocally declared to be a snare:—Christ's flesh is declared "to have been *no better than other flesh* as to its passive qualities or properties, as a creature thing," and for the inherent and innate holiness of Christ's flesh as "a holy thing," taken indeed of the substance of the Virgin, who was sinful, like all the other children of Adam, but made holy in her womb through its miraculous "generation by the Holy Ghost," which is the Scriptural and Catholic truth on this subject, there is substituted the notion of a holiness not of nature, but only of life, by the indwelling in the flesh of Christ of "the power of the Son of God," and of "such a measure of the Holy Ghost as sufficed to resist *its own proclivity to the world and to Satan*;" and along with this there is a plain assertion of the correlative error, that "regeneration doth give to us *the same measure of the Spirit* to do *the same work* of making our flesh the holy thing, the temple of the Holy Ghost;" "the very doctrine," as is distinctly affirmed, "which alone can bring the Church to be meet for the bridegroom."

We do not apprehend that any of our readers will require further proof than this, to convince them that Irvingism is tainted with heresy of the most pernicious kind, whatever judgment they may form as to the origin to which the "utterances" are to be ascribed. Even those who, from the intricacy of the subject, may find it difficult, and from habitual incredulity in the reality of direct satanic agency, may be unwilling, to conclude with Mr. Baxter, that the utterances are indeed supernatural, but that they proceed from the evil one, will be ready to grant, that if there is more here than mere enthusiasm and hysterical excitement,—if there is a "spirit" speaking in these prophets

and prophetesses, it is quite clear, that to make such a confession as that put forth and attested by the utterance in Mr. Irving's letter to Mr. Baxter, is not, in the sense of holy writ, to "confess that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh;" nor is the defect of this confession in the least cured by the singular device of printing the clause of the Nicene Creed, "AND WAS MADE MAN," in small capitals, as is the case in the Communion Office of their Liturgy (No. 3, at the head of this article); literally *typifying* the fact, that this is the cardinal point on which the sect is radically unsound, and desires to be thought pre-eminently sound.

Besides the evidence which it furnishes on the doctrinal character of the sect, the above letter is remarkable for the insinuation which it contains, that the spirit which had spoken in Mr. Baxter might have been "the spirit" of "the accuser of the brethren;" and not only for the insinuation itself, but for the manner in which it is conveyed. "It was said, *I think in the spirit*, that this in you was the same spirit of 'the accuser of the brethren' which hath manifested itself lately amongst us in one of the gifted persons who spoke evil of me in the congregation. But *the Lord hath showed him*, that though it was with power, that power was not from God but from Satan." Here we have it hinted in one case, and in the other distinctly affirmed, that this "power" manifested in the "gifted persons," was in two instances not of God, but of Satan; and that upon the evidence of the utterance itself. The question from which of those two opposite sources any given utterance proceeds, is, and that among the prophets and prophetesses themselves, a debatable question, for the solution of which they depend on the assistance of the utterance itself. And it is by means of the "uncertain sound" thus given forth by the trumpet of this "inspiration," that all the confusions and uncertainties under which universal Christendom is labouring, are to be removed! To a mind capable of the least reflection, and gifted with the most ordinary degree of sobriety, such a pretension, so advanced, carries with it its own refutation.

That the parties themselves were not unconscious of the inconsistency of their position at this time, but without sufficient rectitude of purpose or moral energy to emancipate themselves, as Mr. Baxter did, from the trammels of the delusion in which they had been caught, appears evident from the fact that after the secession of Mr. Baxter they reverted to the original plan of "select meetings," which on the express command of "the spirit," through Mr. Baxter and another of the prophets, had been for some time abandoned. On this point Mr. Baxter makes some forcible remarks:

"I am deeply grieved to find it so: for here, in the midst of minds duly prepared, Satan can gradually develop the subjects of his delusion; and, going on step by step, can unwarily lead his victims into extravagances, first of doctrine, and next of conduct, which they themselves would, without such gradual preparation, shudder to contemplate. So long as their proceedings are open to the public eye, there will always be some warning and remonstrance set before them, upon the development of any new choice. But when shut up to themselves, the mind is gradually darkened, and the delusion becomes daily stronger, until they are ripe for each successive stage of the mystery of iniquity.—As a proof of this, I may allude to the fact, that they are now avowedly exercising apostolic functions, upon the mere command of the voice, without pretending to have the signs of an apostle, 'in signs, and wonders, and mighty deeds:' and the individual who has been thus set apart for the apostolic office, prays, in their meetings, in the following strain:—'Lord, am I not thine Apostle?—yet where are the signs of my Apostleship?—where are the wonders and mighty deeds?—O Lord, send them down upon us,' &c. He has, as an Apostle, and in the name of an Apostle, laid hands on several, and ordained them to the ministerial office, as evangelists and elders; yet it is not pretended that the manifestation of the baptism of the Holy Ghost follows, with the laying on of his hands!—When I was amongst them, we were all of one mind, that the apostolic office could not be exercised, until the signs of an Apostle, in 'signs, wonders, and mighty deeds,' were manifest in the individual claiming the apostolic office; and were also of one mind, that the baptism with the Holy Ghost would attend the laying on of the hands of the Apostle[8]. It appears in their private meetings this further depth of 'folly' has been added to the 'folly' to which I wickedly introduced them; and they are so hardened under it, that they do not now hesitate publicly to declare it."—*Baxter's Narrative*, pp. 84, 85.

What Mr. Baxter here anticipated, writing in 1833, has been fully verified since. Although the sect has its public services, there is an esoteric mysticism connected with it which shuns inquiry. The pretensions to prophecy, and even to miracles, are, indeed, in no degree abated; but the whole thing is carefully

[8] Besides this promise of "Apostles with the full endowment of Apostles in the power of miracles and signs and wonders and gifts of the Holy Ghost," Mr. Baxter mentions four other important prophecies, which (to say nothing of many predictions on minor and less public points which shared the same fate,) have utterly failed. They are, 1. The baptism of fire. 2. An immediate and abundant outpouring of the Holy Ghost in the gifts of working of miracles, gifts of healing, gift of prophecy, gift of discerning of spirits, the gift of tongues, and the interpretation of tongues. 3. Ministers with the full endowment of the Holy Ghost baptized with fire, going forth as missionaries into all parts of the earth. 4. At the close of three years and a half of testimony to the world, commencing from January 14, 1832, the personal coming of the Lord Jesus in glory.—*Irvingism*, pp. 24, 25.

"done in a corner;" and the "secrets of the prison-house" are as jealously concealed from the knowledge of Christians not belonging to the sect, as the holy mysteries of the Church were in the early days of the Gospel from the profane eyes of scoffing pagans. As a proof of this we may mention, that we have had no small difficulty in procuring some of the materials for the present article, and after all we have been unable to procure a mysterious little book which would have thrown considerable light on the character of the sect. Of its existence we are certain, and we know something of its nature; but even what we do know we are precluded from stating, since our endeavours to get a sight of the document itself have been unavailing.

Another, and very material alteration in the character of the sect has been produced by the death of Mr. Irving. While he lived, he continued, in spite of his professed submission to the voice of "the Spirit," to exercise a very considerable control over the whole work, "claiming," inconsistently enough, as Mr. Baxter observes, "authority over the apostle," on the ground of his being "angel of the Church." Now, with all his eccentricities and all his errors, it is but justice to his memory to state that he combined a certain honesty of purpose, which could not but in many ways prove a check upon the delusion, and which on his death-bed manifested itself, as we have good reason to know, by the expression of serious doubts and misgivings as to the whole character of the "dispensation" to which he had sacrificed his former usefulness. When he was removed, the inconsistency of the "angel" claiming authority over the "apostle" was put an end to; for he was succeeded in the leadership of the sect by an "apostle;" one who, without the inconvenience of having to trace his pedigree up to Linus and St. Peter, is not a whit behind the successors of the "Prince of the Apostles." With a conspicuousness which all those who know his religious career from first to last, will at once recognize as highly characteristic, that remarkable individual,—the Tertullian, as we have already shown him to be, of this modern Montanism; an *impromptu* pope, so to speak, who sits in judgment over universal Christendom,—figures in the catalogue of the chief actors given by Mr. Baxter (*Irvingism*, pp. 14, 15), as a regular pluralist of spiritual offices. He appears there, 1. as "the angel of the Church at Albury," called also "the pillar of the angels;" 2. as one of the twelve apostles, and "the pillar of the apostles;" 3. as one of the prophets with only one, Mr. Taplin, whose seniority is indisputable, to take precedency of him. Thus, although an essential and distinctive feature of the sect is "the fourfold ministry," that ministry, with the exception of the inferior office of "evangelist," resolves itself

into "*toujours mouton*," into a complete primacy, centered in one person, of pastoral, apostolic, and prophetic authority.

This practical assumption of supreme power is accompanied, as far as the "Substance of the Lectures delivered in the Churches" enables us to form an opinion, by a dogmatical tone, which occasionally becomes ludicrous from the absence of either divine warrant or human qualification adequate to support it. Of one who pronounces such sweeping condemnation upon all Christendom, and demonstrates from its past history and present condition the necessity of his sect, that sect which is after all but an *alter ego*, one might at least expect a decent acquaintance with Church history. It is impossible not to feel that the grandiloquence of the conclusion ill accords with the ignorance of the premises, when one finds this sect vaunting itself as a restoration of the primitive order of the Church, after a long period of misrule by "a sole bishop," the pope, whose government is spoken of as if it had immediately succeeded that of the twelve Apostles [9], being enforced by the *secular* weapons of the temporal power, or as Mr. Drummond, somewhat unmindful of the thirteenth of Romans, designates it, "the power of the beast;" a view in which not only the ages which preceded the rise of the Papacy are wholly lost sight of, but the existence of the Church is represented as incomplete, and hardly deserving the name of the Church, from the day that St. John died, to the day when Mr. Drummond became the "pillar of the apostles," and resumed the work at the point where, contrary to Christ's promise, "Lo, I am with you *alway*, even unto the end of the world," it was broken off by the death of the last Apostle more than seventeen centuries ago.

No less gross is the ignorance which underlies another of Mr. Drummond's views respecting the character and mission of his sect. According to that view this revival of the prophetic and apostolic offices has for its object, to gather out from all denominations of Christians the elect of God, and to "seal" them by the imposition of apostolic hands; the "seal" so conferred being one of the "blessings they cannot obtain in the bodies whereof they are members, for want of *the machinery necessary to confer them*." (p. 105.) After many disparaging remarks on the

[9] See the development of this strange view upon which the whole theory of the sect is based, in "Substance of Lectures," pp. 7—10. Compare also, p. 14, where it is said: "The history of the Church from the earliest period since the death of St. John down to the present time, is just such a history as that of any secular state; the same principles, the same practices, the same good and the same evil, modified only by the personal characters of the different *individuals* who have ruled her." The same view appears in other parts of the volume.

different Christian communions, and especially the Church of England, illustrative of this alleged "want of the necessary machinery," Mr. Drummond thus establishes his position:

"All who shall be enabled to endure to the end, must be confirmed or strengthened for that special object, and with that express intention. The Sacrament of Confirmation is of no more avail in the Episcopal Churches now than the Sacrament of the Eucharist is in the Presbyterian Churches; it is no Sacrament at all, it is a mere lifeless form. But the dry bones must be made to live by the Spirit of the Lord acting upon them, which never will be done but through the order of ministers" (*i. e.* apostles) "which He appointed for that purpose at the beginning. To that order must all Churches who lack the oil seek, or they never can obtain it. The SEALING" (Mr. Drummond's own capitals) "is spoken of in the records of the beginning ofthe Church, because the ordinance existed which could effect it; and it is referred to again in the Apocalypse, at the close of the dispensation, because the ordinance was to be revived for that end. During the whole course of the dispensation, however, *there has been no such intention as to seal by the rite of confirmation; the very word is disused;* the imitation of it has been proved for ages to be worthless: but it must now be resumed in the hour of the Church's extremest peril and deliverance."—*Substance of Lectures*, p. 111.

Now this is unquestionably a magnificent view to take of his own mission and that of his brother apostles; and if it could be substantiated, it would go far to get rid of the intercalation of the seventeen centuries during which the Church has, according to Mr. Drummond, been in a mummy or chrysalis state, and to establish the direct and unbroken line of apostolic succession for which he contends; viz. St. Peter, St. Paul, St. John, Mr. Taplin, Mr. Drummond, Mr. Cardale, &c. Unfortunately, however, for his view, it does not happen to be true, that "there has been no such intention as to *seal* by the rite of confirmation," and that "the very word is disused;" for, as a matter of fact, the ordinance of confirmation is spoken of as "the *seal* of the gift of the Holy Ghost" in the Canons of the second Œcumenical Council[10], and the same words are retained to this day in the Confirmation office of the Churches of the Greek communion[1]. The same is the case in the Latin Church, which accompanies the anointing with the chrism in the form of a cross with the words, "*Signo te signo crucis*[2];" the word *signare* being the very word used in the Latin Vulgate to render the Greek σφραγίζω in the Apocalypse.

[10] Concil. Constantin. I. Œcum. II. Can. VII.
[1] King's Rites and Ceremonies of the Greek Church in Russia, p. 215.
[2] Pontific. Rom. Ed. II. Romana. Romæ, 1818, p. 3.

It is the translation of this word "*signo*" by "I sign," in the English liturgy, and the subsequent transfer of that part of the rite of confirmation, without the use of chrism, into the baptismal office[3], which has caused the formal disappearance of the notion of "sealing" from the Confirmation office of the English Church, though the idea of it is substantially retained. Besides which a man as learned in ecclesiastical lore, as from the copious disquisitions and allegations out of Durandus and other writers, on ecclesiastical vestments and "all the colours in the rainbow," with which the fifth lecture abounds, the uninitiated must needs suppose Mr. Drummond to be, ought to have known that the term σφραγὶς in Greek, and the term *sigillum Domini* in Latin writers, is a far from unusual expression to denote the ordinance of Confirmation. While we are on this subject, we would venture to suggest that if he should have occasion again to unfold his wisdom to "the Churches," on points involving the use of Greek theological terms, he will not despise so small a matter as the discernment between *spiritus asper* and *spiritus lenis;* for although we doubt not that the metropolitan idiom of his prophets will supply the deficiency in oral communication, there is a remarkably naked and uncomfortable look in the words "*omoousia*" and "*omoiousia*" (p. 304), when presented to the eye in print. Within the pale of "the Churches" this may pass well enough, for "*luscus inter cæcos*" has ever been "a burning and a shining light;" but unfortunately that luminary is over-apt to look like a farthing rushlight when carried forth into the broad sunshine of the world.

But leaving these matters of "anise and cummin," let us turn to the "weightier matter" of the evidence which Mr. Drummond has to produce in support of his assertion, that his sect is set for the revival of those things in the Church, which he, through ignorance, as we have seen, imagines to have been extinct in her ever since the death of St. John. To clear that assertion from the reproach of a gratuitous and conceited assumption, it requires something rather more substantial in the way of proof than his dreamy interpretations of the furniture of the tabernacle, and his lengthy and recondite criticisms on the various sorts and numbers of lamps, candlesticks, and chandeliers in use in different ages and

[3] See the first Prayer-book of Edward VI., where the act of Confirmation was preceded by the prayer, "*Sign* them, O Lord, and *mark* them to be Thine for ever;" and the act itself accompanied by the words, "I *sign* thee (*signo te*) with the sign of the Cross, and lay my hand upon thee, in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen." See the two Books of Common Prayer, set forth by authority of Parliament in the reign of King Edward the Sixth. Oxf. 1838. pp. 349, 350.

Churches, headed up into the somewhat ungrammatical, if not illogical, conclusion, that "there *is* still wanted two principal lamps" (p. 251), which accordingly "*is*," or are provided in "the twofold stream of apostleship and prophecy" (p. 249), which issues forth from the temple in Newman-street. Nor will it do, in support of a view for which the most that can be said is, that Mr. Drummond fancies, as well as affirms, that it is so, to declare (p. 250) that "in the following vision, lately seen by a prophetic person in church during the celebration of the blessed Eucharist, the same truth is shown." We are reminded by this and other like references to the "voices" and "visions" of the "prophets" and "prophetesses" of the sect, which occur here and there in Mr. Drummond's volume, of Tertullian's equally incontrovertible argument in support of his notion of the materiality of the soul. "Because," he says, "we" (the Montanists) "acknowledge spiritual gifts, we too have been thought worthy after John to obtain the gift of prophecy. There is at this time with us a sister who has received gifts of revelations, which come upon her in the spirit by ecstasy in the Church during divine service[4]; when she converses with angels, sometimes also with the Lord, and sees and hears mysteries, and discerns the hearts of some, and suggests medicines to those who desire them[5]." Upon the evidence of one of the visions of this "sister," Tertullian takes the materiality of the soul to be as indisputable, as Mr. Drummond, upon like evidence, the necessity of the "fourfold ministry," and the divine authority of his own "apostolate." And in the inflation of these *pseudo*-apostolic and *pseudo*-prophetic offices, these sectarians, like the Montanists of old, hesitate not to depreciate God's ordinance in His Church, the episcopate, as a lifeless and powerless office.

"As long," says the anonymous author of a 'Discourse on the Office of Apostles,' No. 2, at the head of this article, "as government rested on the shoulder of 'Apostles,' the burden was sustained; when Apostles ceased, 'Bishops' could not sustain it; for God had not laid it upon Bishops. Whatever the baptized may have attained to in the things of this world since Apostles ceased to rule, the Church has never known a full measure of grace. Men have not entered into rest through faith, but have been bearing their own burdens instead of meekly coming to Christ and taking His yoke upon them. Thus the spiritual *onus* and charge of the Church at large has been like some grievous

[4] "*Inter Dominica solemnia*;" which might be rendered also "during the celebration of the Eucharist;" but the sequel seems to indicate that the general worship of the congregation, including the reading of Scripture, psalmody, and preaching, is here intended.

[5] Tertullian. de Animâ, c. ix.

weight suspended on a man's finger or outstretched arm. Where it has devolved, it has been felt to be intolerable, and has been shifted about from one region to another, bruising and straining all the parts over which it has passed. But the burden can never rest until it fairly comes on the shoulder of 'Apostles' again; all others who meddle with 'Jerusalem' will find it 'a burdensome stone,' a mere dead weight, without any corresponding measure of spiritual life imparted to sustain it."—*Discourse on the Office of Apostles*, pp. 3, 4.

This contemptuous view of the highest ordinance of God's Church, throughout the whole of her existence since her first foundation by apostolic hands, is the burden of the whole "discourse," and it meets the eye, again and again, in Mr. Drummond's volume. In his scheme of hierarchical order, founded upon the well-known Irvingite misinterpretation of Eph. iv. 11, the bishops are deposed from the functions which they have exercised in the Church since the day when St. Paul gave directions to Timothy and Titus for the exercise of their delegated authority; for, as the modern "pillar of the apostles" says,—

"All the several bishoprics are united together by the apostles, prophets, and other ministers of the Church universal, who have no authority or jurisdiction in the interior of the several particular Churches, but *to whom alone it belongs* to *consecrate the angels*" (the corresponding office to that of Bishops in this scheme) "and *ordain the priests*, thereby fitting them through the imposition of hands for the fulfilment of their various callings; and also to *confirm and strengthen the people by the imposition of hands*, for the due performance of the particular duties of their Church relationships and mutual dependence one upon another."—*Substance of Lectures*, pp. 233, 234.

And in another place, after demolishing the authority of the Pope, to whom he is inclined to make very large concessions, and thinks (p. 6) "it is much to be regretted that the defenders of the supremacy of the Patriarch of Rome have taken their stand upon premises which are wholly untrue, and not upon others which are undeniable," Mr. Drummond thus continues:

"If the Patriarch of the West, and Bishop in the imperial capital of the Holy Roman Empire, errs in considering himself not only a Bishop, but the sole inheritor of apostolic authority and duty, by virtue of which he is able to rule the Universal Church, and authorized to consecrate Bishops, the Bishops of the Church of England do more *err in affecting a power to consecrate Bishops*, whilst renouncing all higher standing than the episcopal; for it is as contrary to sound ecclesiastical principles for Bishops to consecrate Bishops, as it would be for priests to ordain priests. It was, therefore, to be expected that, whenever

God should commence the work of cleansing His sanctuary, His first act should be as of old, when the priesthood of Eli and his sons was changed for another family, to call forth *a new line* of priests."—*Substance of Lectures*, pp. 102, 103.

And again:

"If the Pope be not invested with Apostolic authority, certainly no other person or persons in the established Churches are. No Bishops are: *if they exercise any Apostolic authority, it is by usurpation.* Necessity may justify their doing so, as it may any other departure from fixed laws; but it is another thing to contend, that the departure and the usurpation are legitimate. A Church is a unity if it is under one jurisdiction and government, and not if it has diverse governments: it is apostolic if it has apostles, and not if it is without them. If it is not a unity, each part must do the best it can for itself; and if it has not apostles, it must do the best it can without them; but *in neither case is it lawful to tell lies*, and assert it is a unity and is apostolic, when all mankind sees it is neither the one nor the other."—*Substance of Lectures*, p. 106.

Truly we live to learn. Finding the Nicene Creed in its place in the "Liturgy and other Divine Offices of the Church," we took some comfort, hoping that, after all, the "Irvingites" might not be so very far from the one Catholic faith. But see how we were mistaken. We have already noticed the sense in which the clause "AND WAS MADE MAN" is to be understood, as confessed to in Newman-street; and now we learn, that when they confess, in common with the Church universal, their belief in "*one* Catholic and *Apostolic* Church," their meaning of this confession is, that at the time when this clause was appended to the creed by the Council of Constantinople, it was an "unlawful lie," having then ceased to be true for nearly three centuries, and that it has been an "unlawful lie" ever since, and continues to be so in all the Churches of Christendom, Eastern and Western, Roman and Anglican, in all but in that one Church which soars high above them all, if not in spirituality, at least in spiritual pride; the Church whose unity and apostolicity is infallibly and irrevocably secured by the concentration of its powers in the ecclesiastical supremacy of the apostle-prophet-angel, the pillar of apostles and angels, Mr. Henry Drummond. Probably our readers will agree with us in thinking that, with one who affords, to use his own expression (p. 125), such a "brilliant example of his apostolic talent," it would be a mere waste of words to argue on the question, what are and what are not "sound ecclesiastical principles." We had rather act upon Solomon's advice, to "answer a fool according to his folly," by transcribing the following testimony

of St. Jerome to a similar depreciation of the episcopal office by the original Montanist sect:

"With us," says the indignant presbyter of Stridon, "the Bishops fill the place of the Apostles, but with them the Bishop is third in order. For in the first rank they place the patriarchs of Pepuza in Phrygia; in the second rank those whom they call Cenones; and so the Bishops are hurled down to the third, that is, almost the lowest place; as if their sect became the more exalted by making that last among them, which among us ranks first[6]."

St. Jerome, it seems, came to much the same conclusion respecting the pretensions of Pepuza as that which we have arrived at respecting those of Albury; immeasurable self-exaltation, coupled with ineffable contempt for Christians of every communion in general, and for the true Catholic Church in particular, is the characteristic feature of false prophecy; the spirit from which its utterance proceeds, is a scornful spirit, and delights to sneer at the ordinance of God.

To adduce all the instances of intolerable arrogance which are scattered up and down through the semi-oracular publications of the sect in Newman-street, to confute all its erroneous and heretical notions, to castigate its numberless absurdities, and to expose the ignorance and self-contradiction which pervade the whole system, would far exceed the limits to which we must confine ourselves. The materials before us would fill a volume, and furnish abundant entertainment as well as instruction. But even the few points which, out of a large number of notes, we have selected for our article, will be sufficient to show the real character of the sect, and to put the unwary on their guard.

That a sect like that with which we have now brought our readers acquainted, should start up at this time, is by no means surprising. There are truths, deep and important truths, to be testified at the present critical juncture. It is unquestionably true, that the indwelling presence, and effectual operation in the Church, of God the Holy Ghost, is too much lost sight of; that His ordinances are sadly dishonoured, or neglected altogether. The denial, so extensively insisted on and countenanced, of His regenerating power in the Sacrament of Holy Baptism,—the reluctance, it is to be feared, of too many to look for the exhibition by Him of the things of Christ in the other Sacrament,—the miserably low view that is almost universally taken of the ordinance of Confirmation,—the consequent insufficiency of the preparatory instruction imparted to candidates, who in many cases

[6] S. Hieron. Ep. xxvii. *ad Marcellam.*

are not aware of the blessing for which they ought to look and to pray,—the painful manner in which, from the numerical inadequacy of the Episcopate to the wants of the population, the ordinance is generally ministered,—the recent attempt to supply the lamentable deficiency in the numbers of the parochial clergy, by the introduction into the Church of a new order of ministers licensed but not ordained, sent forth, but not endowed with the spiritual gifts for the dispensing of which the ordinance of laying on of hands was instituted by the Apostles,—the virtual abolition of the diaconate which has merged into a mere probationary state in anticipation of the presbyterate,—the admission to the order of the priesthood, under solemn invocation of the Holy Ghost, of many who all but deny the doctrine of a transmission of ministerial gifts in ordination, and of many more who enter the ministry as a mere profession, under the influence of worldly motives and prospects,—and last, not least, the dishonour done to God the Holy Ghost by the use of His name in the different stages of episcopal creation, which recent circumstances have exhibited in the degrading light of empty forms and ceremonies to be gone through at the bidding of political dictation, while the solemn offices appointed by the Church imply at every step the deepest, the most awful spiritual realities,—all these things testify to a want of perception of the personal presence of the Holy Ghost in the Church and in all her ordinances, as loudly as the self-will and self-seeking of the age testify to His absence from the hearts of too many of her members.

And if from the internal condition of the Church, we turn to her outward position, and to the general aspect of the world, it is as unquestionably true that the "signs of the times" bear with daily greater distinctness the appearance of the signs of the last days, that there is abundant reason to anticipate that the time of the end is not far distant. That expectation depends no longer upon questionable interpretations of prophetic symbols, and upon doubtful calculations of prophetic dates; it rests in the minds of thoughtful men upon the broader and more solid basis of the character of the times, judged of by the light of revelation. The rapid growth of open, and the wide diffusion of covert infidelity on one hand, and the gigantic strides which the Papacy is taking on the other hand,—the state of captivity to which, by their joint operations, the Church of Christ in this land is reduced,—the wide spread of radicalism, and the daily increasing inability of the conservative elements in the different states of Europe to resist its progress,—above all, the combination of numberless dissentient and antagonistic principles in one concordant and deadly hostility against God's ordinance in Church and State,—

all this seems to indicate, that the development of evil is approaching its culminating point, and that the final struggle between Christian and Antichristian principles, in the midst of which Christ will appear for the redemption of His Church, is close at hand.

The declaration, therefore, of these two truths, the presence and effectual operation of the Holy Ghost in the Church, and the nearness of the second Advent of Christ, is pre-eminently the teaching of which the age stands in need. Accordingly it might be expected, that Satan would put forth some device of singular subtlety and power of delusion, for the twofold purpose of ensnaring and leading astray minds predisposed by a high tone of spirituality for the perception of those truths, and of throwing a slur upon the declaration of them, by identifying it in the popular mind with the absurd and untenable pretensions of a fanatical sect. This we believe to be the true solution of the mystery involved in the rise of the Irvingite heresy, with its pseudo-prophetic character. The undoubted piety of many who have been caught in this snare, and the singular admixture of the most striking and seasonable truths with the most palpable errors and absurdities, give to this ecclesiastical phenomenon a character peculiarly its own; a character which stamps the sect itself as one of the signs of the last times, in fulfilment of that word of Christ, that "false prophets shall arise, and shall show signs and wonders to seduce, if it were possible, even the elect[7]."

[7] Mark xiii. 22.

ART. III.—1. *Adventures in the Pacific, &c. By* JOHN COULTER, *M.D.* Dublin: Curry. London: Longmans, 1845.

2. *Adventures on the Western Coast of South America, and the Interior of California, including a Narrative of Incidents at the Kingsmill Islands, New Ireland, New Britain, New Guinea, and other Islands in the Pacific Ocean. By* J. COULTER, *M.D.* In 2 vols. London: Longmans, 1847.

3. *Typee; or, a Narrative of a Four Months' Residence among the Natives of a Valley of the Marquesas Islands. By* HERMAN MELVILLE. 1 vol. London: Murray, 1847.

4. *Omoo: a Narrative of Adventures in the South Seas, being a Sequel to the "Residence in the Marquesas Islands." By* HERMAN MELVILLE. 1 vol. London: Murray, 1847.

THERE are few of our readers, we presume, to whom the very name of the South Seas does not call up many a pleasing recollection of earlier days—of happy hours spent in the perusal of the wild adventures and daring achievements of our great naval commanders—of those who, in earlier days, humbled the pride and seized the wealth of Spain, when her power was at the highest; or who at a later period gained as honourable a renown by serving the cause of science and discovery. How many names of our national worthies seem to start up from the map as we glance at the wide extent of waters which stretches from the Australian to the American Continent! what a deep and almost domestic interest and sympathy seems to bind us to every group in the Pacific!

The works which stand at the head of this article are well calculated to confirm and strengthen any favourable impression which we may have previously entertained regarding the lands which they describe. Dr. Coulter's volumes possess throughout the interest of a first-rate novel, carrying with them an open truthfulness which tells us at once that we can put our full trust in the author's veracity, however wild and wonderful may be the scenes which he describes, or the incidents which he narrates; his tone, too, is always just what it should be; no pretension to high-flown sentiment, or any other species of hypocrisy, moral, intellectual, or religious: but an honest straightforward denunciation of all that is base and wicked, and a warm admiration and ready sympathy for every noble deed, or kindly feeling. The British

public would be the better for more such writers, and the South Sea islanders for more such visiters.

We cannot give the same commendation to Mr. Herman Melville, supposing him to be a real personage, which we are bound to do, till we hear the contrary. Full of incident, indeed, his works are, no doubt, and convey much curious and interesting information regarding the islands, the natives, the vagabond sailors, and the gallant "*Wee wees.*" The author exhibits also a just and warm indignation against the cruelty and rapacity so often practised by the Europeans on the islanders of the Pacific; he laments, too, the other evils which the white man has inflicted on the Kannaka; and, which makes the task of censuring him doubly painful, he every where treats England and the English with candour and friendliness. There is, however, a laxity of moral feeling, an absence of religious principle throughout both works, which there should not be; and the jesting tone, or the unoffensive expression which accompany or veil the most objectionable passages, make them yet more pernicious. In Typee these things are less apparent, though that work is deserving of severe censure. In Omoo, however, the cloven foot is much too visible to be mistaken, despite of the common-place declarations of respect for religion and morals.

The first island of the Pacific which occurs in Dr. Coulter's narrative, is one which, perhaps, more than any other, recalls those boyish memories to which we have alluded, we mean Juan Fernandez, the dwelling-place of Alexander Selkirk, and the original of that delightful fiction, the island of Robinson Crusoe.

"There were no inhabitants on the island," says Dr. Coulter, "when we arrived; some time before there were about one thousand convicts sent there by the Chilian government; but they rose on the soldiers in charge of them, and killed them and the governor; afterwards boarded two vessels at anchor at the time, and made them land them on the coast. I understood that they were hunted by the troops on landing, and afterwards shot."

It really seems too bad to turn such a place into a penal colony.

"After leaving the beach you arrive at a large strip of level land: the remains of the houses, or rather huts, in a state of ruins, were scattered about on either side; also the remains of an old jail, or lock-up. On passing the huts, this level land is found to extend to twenty or thirty acres. There were vast quantities of rose bushes in full bloom, with immense beds of mint so tall that you could hide in it without being discovered. The fragrance of this valley was quite enchanting to us. The small hills surrounding it, thickly covered with middling-sized timber in rich foliage, and a small rippling stream running through it

added to the beauty. In strolling up the hills, we soon discovered that the smaller timber had a very loose hold in the earth, which was mostly red mould, as some of our men on laying hold of them to assist themselves up, came back accompanied by the tree. The entire island is a succession of small hills and valleys, each with its little stream; and these rivulets often uniting, came dashing over the cliffs with great force. On it we discovered some bullocks, goats, and dogs, all in good condition, but very wild, dashing through the thickets like deer when disturbed. There was also no want of fish, as the water round the islands abounds with the best rock-cod I ever saw."

Having made prize of sundry of the edible portion of the animals—we do not hear that the dogs, although "in good condition," formed part of the ship's stores—they set sail, and after touching at nearly all the principal ports on the South American coast, reached the Gallapagos. The merits of these much-traduced islands Dr. Coulter is extremely anxious to impress upon the British public, and we think rightly. Most assuredly no uninhabited islands with a rich soil, fine climate, and eligible situation, ought to be long out of our possession, affording at once, as they would do, an outlet for our population, a field for our enterprize, and a station for our navy. That which Xerxes vainly tried to do, we have succeeded in doing,—we have placed fetters on the sea; the ocean is our subject; we should take good care, both for our own sake, and that of others, that we allow no rivals in our empire. It is not for the advantage of the world that America should disseminate her slaveholding republicanism, or France inoculate other lands with her double parallelism of social pestilence—popery interwined with atheism, and anarchy embracing despotism. The Gallapagos ought to be at once appropriated by the British government—indeed, though we have no right to take possession of the inhabited islands of the Pacific—we should take care that our scruples do not place the natives in a worse position than the want of them would produce; we should take care that whilst ourselves abstaining from acts of robbery and injustice, of outrage and oppression, we prevent other civilized powers from following the course which in our own case we repudiate. All the Polynesian groups have a right to British protection, and if a high-principled and high-spirited ministry were at the head of affairs, they would not expect it in vain.

On one of the Gallapagos, Charles's Island, a Spaniard from Ecuador had formed a colony consisting of negroes. It did not, indeed, last long, for shortly after our author's departure, they rose and assassinated the pompous and tyrannical, though gentleman-like officer. He, however, was not the first lord of the island. An

Irishman of the name of Pat, and a Swede, Johan Johnson, successively held solitary possession of the place, subjecting to their authority all runaway sailors who took refuge there. The histories of these men, and of others like them, dwelling on uninhabited islands of the Pacific, form one of the many interesting features of these works.

Wishing to ascertain more accurately the capabilities of these islands, our author determined on exploring one of them, Chatam Island, as the vessel was to remain there for some time:—

"I prepared for it accordingly; I put on light canvas trousers, a leathern jacket, a pair of strong shoes on, a belt round me to hold my small axe, knife, and ammunition-pouch, a leather cap on my head, and a canteen for water. As the island was large, and I intended to go into the interior, I took the precaution of bringing a pocket compass with me. Being thus accoutred, with gun in hand, on the fourth morning after our arrival here I left the encampment at sunrise, under a volley of three cheers from our men. As I had previously a very good knowledge of the shore around the island, its bays, beaches, rocks, and anchoring-places, I now kept inland, and directed my course in a range with the centre of it, the island being very long from east to west, but in breadth (some places) from north to south, only a few miles. During the chief part of the first day I had to make my way through a thick wood, which in some places I had to proceed circuitously, to avoid the thick net-work formed by a wild vine, growing so close, that I could not get through it. Towards sun-down, having accomplished about eight miles under great difficulties, I got into an open country, with the timber farther apart, and a good deal of grass. A great many terrapin[1] were feeding on it. . . . . I chose an elevated spot of land beside a large rock to encamp for the night. I next cut down with my axe a few branches, and placed them up against it, which formed covering enough in so fine a climate. There was plenty of long grass about, which I pulled up, and shook out on the earth under this temporary hut. This served me well for a bed, and was my general plan of arranging for the night. The preparations were simple and soon completed. I then killed a small terrapin, made a fire, and cooked it on cross sticks, and, with some fresh water I found not far off, made a hearty supper. As the shade from the setting sun was making every object around me and in the distance indistinct, I lay down in my primitive hut, and never enjoyed a more refreshing sleep than I did that night. I did not awake till the sun was well up next day, and when I came out of my hut, the whole place all about seemed to be alive with birds of all sorts, doves, canaries, mocking-birds, hawks, &c. All were bound to the eastward; and so unacquainted were they with man, that many

[1] "Terrapin" signifies land-tortoise. Most of the Polynesian wildernesses swarm with these animals, whilst the coasts are equally well furnished with the green turtle.

of them perched for a moment on my shoulders and cap to rest themselves. Now this passage of birds in the morning, in any particular direction, gives most important intelligence to the man who may be cast on an island like this, without any previous knowledge of it. It tells him at once that if he only follows the birds, or keeps on after them, he is sure to fall in with that all-important thing—fresh water . . . I have often," proceeds he, " known men lose themselves through the interior of islands, and be found all but exhausted for the want of water, though there was plenty not far from them. This arose from their . . . . not knowing how to look for it. It would be long before you could find a native of any of the islands to the westward so much deficient. Land one of them on any uninhabited island, and he knows how to light his fire, where to find water, and if there is any thing fit for food growing on it. Another way to find water, is to get up on a hill, or climb a tall tree, and look well around you in the valleys or low grounds; if you see a patch of fresh foliage of a livelier green than the rest, make straight for that, and you are almost sure to see the water; if the ground should be only moist, cut a branch or pole, flatten the end of it with your axe, and after digging down a little so as to make a small hole, the water will come up soon. Then again, if there is (about two or three hundred yards from the beach) any spot of ground lower than the beach, and nearly on a level with the sea, by digging deep enough the water will be found very fresh; and if there cannot be obtained by all these means a supply, there are always in tropical climates trees of a soft description, such as the cabbage-tree, &c., which by tapping the stem, or pounding the branches between stones, a quantity of juice may be obtained sufficient to allay thirst for the time, until the water can be hunted for."—p. 98.

These remarks are extremely valuable, and suggest to us the expediency of some short directions for shipwrecked persons, printed in a cheap and durable form, and distributed like the directions for restoring life, circulated by the Royal Humane Society: they would have the same effect, that of preserving life where it would otherwise be lost.

" Along nearly the whole of the island, from east to west, there are two ranges of hills, some of them of great altitude; between those in the depth of the gorge, there is one continued valley of about three miles wide, interrupted only by a few irregular hills or swells here and there, only partially timbered, but clothed with luxuriant grass. The sides of the high hills bounding it are covered up to their summits—indeed right across—with timber. . . . . Not far from the place I immerged into the valley there was a curious heap of large and small stones, which looked so artificial as to give the appearance of a quarry which had been worked: with some inconvenience I examined it, and found at the upper part of it a large, dark, mysterious entrance to a huge cave, extending apparently away under the mountains; I could not get directly up to it as the stones were loose, and slid off each other when I

stood on them, so I merely contented myself with throwing a few stones far in, but could not hear them alight any where; the only things disturbed were a few large splendid owls, which I presume were resting somewhere out of the light. It appeared to be a solemn-looking unfathomable gulf, through which, no doubt, those immense heaps of stones were discharged at a very remote period by some volcanic agency."—p. 102.

The vegetation here was very luxuriant—a fine stream of water flowed through the centre of the valley, and besides indigenous animals Dr. Coulter saw a great quantity of reddish-coloured goats, which, strange to say, never showed themselves on the coast. The hawks which were very numerous proved extremely annoying when a goat or terrapin was killed, and the only way of getting rid of them was to kill one first for their private eating and then look out for himself.

"About the middle of the valley," says he, "my attention was attracted to the foot of one of the hills, where the earth had fallen down, and left exposed to view large black rocks; I went over and examined it, and found them to consist of coal in large quantities, and extending away in under the hills. . . . . To test my discovery I cooked (my meal) on a wooden spit before a large fine fire of coal; it quickly ignited, flamed up, and burned after the cheerful manner of Kendal coal. There were great hills of it, and an immense supply could be here obtained, if there was a sufficient arrangement to convey it to the sea-side."—p. 107.

This is indeed an important discovery, and one which renders the Gallapagos particularly well suited to become what our author wishes them to be,—a station for steamers between Darien and Australia.

In another part of the island there is a great variety of mineral treasures.

"Amongst the rocks and hills skirting this ravine, there is iron ore of apparently excellent description; and here again I fell in with coal, which I pronounce to be excellent, having again practically tested it by using it for my fire. There were also beds of sulphur without much impurity in it. I found on the south-east part very pure lead ore in great abundance. Indeed, the whole island, particularly about the hills, seemed to be rich with the ordinarily useful minerals."—p. 126.

One more extract, it must be a long one, and we have done with Chatam island. If it affects our readers as it did us, they will not blame us for inserting it.

"When I was better than half way down the weather side, at about four miles inland, I came suddenly on a piece of ground which was

partially clear, and where a few trees lay, that had evidently a few years ago been cut down by some one. On further entering this space there were mustard, pumpkins, melons, Indian corn, sweet potatoes, and tobacco, all growing indiscriminately and in a very wild state, tall weeds, and suckers of young trees, starting up here and there from the roots of the old ones.

"In looking about I saw what was once a spade, but the blade of which now was only rust, and fell in pieces when I touched it with my foot. Near this, in a hollow, was a well with water enough, but overgrown and covered with weeds. It was regularly built round with stone. I continued my search over this once well-cared plantation, until I came to the highest or upper part of the clearing, which was walled along for several hundred yards by solid rock. Up near this, almost concealed by a clump of trees, and nearly overgrown with wild vine, I discovered a house, or rather a hut, on a comfortable scale. There was no sound of human voice here, all was still.

"I knew from the indications about, that it was long since the place had been attended to. The net-work of vines round it was so thick and close, that I had to make an opening through it with my axe. On entering this wild barrier, I came at once on the house, which was built against the rock with a shed roof thatched—the sides and front merely posts of wood, interlaced by vine branches, and covered over with mud. The whole was in a falling state; there was only a door way into it, but no door.

"I now with strange feelings entered the door; there was ample light through this ruin to see all. It was a melancholy sight and discovery to me. In the centre of the floor, near a rude table, lay the skeleton of a man, only partially concealed by what had once been a covering of skins; on my touching it, it fell in powder; the bones, though in apposition, were separated by the slightest touch. On one side were an old boiling pot and frying-pan, wood, axe, &c., all in rust, a tobacco-box, with a rudely manufactured pipe, on the table an old worn out and rust-eaten carabine, and cutlass in the corner; there was a shelf which had once served for a bed with seal skins on it. I searched minutely, but could not find either paper or any other thing that could give the least information as to the name or who this unfortunate recluse was.

* * * * *

"Whilst in those seas I made many inquiries from captains and others frequenting those islands about this solitary man, but no one knew or had heard any thing about him. He must have been dead for many years from the state of the skeleton, the hut, and the long neglected plantations."—p. 135.

Who and what was this man? a runaway sailor? a shipwrecked mariner? an exiled patriot? a fugitive rebel? a broken-hearted recluse? a criminal flying from the sentence of the law—perhaps

a murderer? or was he some grievous sinner, who sought in silence and solitude to reconcile himself with his God?

From the Gallapagos Captain Lock proceeded to the Marquesas. These islands were first visited in 1595 by a Spanish navigator, Alvaro Mendana de Neyra, who in compliment to the Marquess Mendoza, then Viceroy of Peru, gave them the name which they still bear. They extend about two hundred miles from N. W. to S. E., and lie between latitude 10° 30′ and 7° 50′ south, and longitude 139° and 141° west. A wide channel divides them into two smaller groups, of which the Eastern contains five and the Western eight.

"The scenery of the entire Marquesan group of islands is very similar; they all appear high, and almost precipitous towards the centre: but on coming close into the land, and taking long excursions through the country, if we may so term it, the scene entirely alters, and one of great irregular beauty and grandeur meets the eye in all directions. The inhabitants generally live scattered about in the low lands or rich valleys; and rich they are beyond any thing. Those who have not visited a tropical country cannot form a correct idea of it; wherever you see a rock or precipice, and they well deserve the name, if irregularity, height, and nakedness can give it to them; their base and surrounding lowland is covered deeply with a never-ceasing, richly vegetable mould, throwing up the finest fruit-trees and other large timber; and where the woods are not very dense, the richest grass prevails. All those valleys have streams, sometimes of considerable extent, but always of great beauty, passing through them, forming in their course many rich and beautiful cascades. Those valleys are mostly skirted with high hills, covered to their summits with a lightish green vegetation. This coloured appearance arises from the great quantities of deep soft moss and acres upon acres of small reeds, which grow as high as eight or ten feet, and form good cover often for small war parties or scouts, who frequently set the whole on fire to stop, even for a time, the advance of a powerful enemy, as well as to give the warning that those great fires convey to their friends."—p. 164.

Wild and beautiful indeed those islands must be from the accounts of all those who have visited them, and equally wild and beautiful are the race that inhabit them; but there is a striking and painful difference between the animate and inanimate works of the Creator, which, sadly visible every where, stands out here in terrible relief. Nature is all beautiful and glorious, but man, though highly gifted both physically and mentally, "has sought out for himself many inventions" which it is revolting to think of; and what makes the case still more humbling is, that disgusting as the native vices of the islanders are, they have been here as elsewhere still further corrupted by their intercourse with

those who come from lands that acknowledge the religion of a merciful, a holy, and a jealous God. Yes, degraded as the Polynesian is in his ancestral condition, he is far more debased after coming in contact with the European. The naked vices of the savage assume if not a grosser yet a more sordid character.

"Towards noon, we drew abreast the entrance to the harbour," says Mr. Melville, "and at last we slowly swept by the intervening promontory, and entered the bay of Nukuheva. No description can do justice to its beauty; but that beauty was lost to me then, and I saw nothing but the tricoloured flag of France trailing over the stern of six vessels, whose black hulls and bristling broadsides proclaimed their warlike character. There they were, floating in that lovely bay, the green eminences of the shore looking down so tranquilly upon them as if rebuking the sternness of their aspect. To my eye, nothing could be more out of keeping than the presence of these vessels; but we soon learnt what brought them there. The whole group of islands had just been taken possession of by Rear-Admiral Du Petit Thouars in the name of the invincible French nation."—*Residence in the Marquesas*, p. 12.

Mr. Melville is no friend to the conduct of France towards the natives of Tahiti and Nukuheva.

"The expedition," says he, "for the occupation of the Marquesas had sailed from Brest in the spring of 1842, and the secret of its destination was solely in the possession of its commander. No wonder that those who contemplated such a signal infraction of the laws of humanity, should have sought to veil the enormity from the eyes of the world; and yet, notwithstanding their iniquitous conduct in this and in other matters, the French have ever plumed themselves upon being the most humane and polished of nations. . . . . One example of the shameless subterfuges under which the French stand prepared to defend whatever cruelties they may hereafter think fit to commit in bringing the Marquesan natives into subjection, is well worthy of being recorded. On some flimsy pretext or other, Mowanna, the King of Nukuheva, whom the invaders by extravagant presents have cajoled over to their interest, and move about like a mere puppet, has been set up as the rightful sovereign of the entire island, the alleged ruler by prescription of various clans who for ages, perhaps, have treated with each other as separate nations. To reinstate this much injured prince in the assumed dignities of his ancestors, the disinterested strangers have come all the way from France; they are determined that his title shall be acknowledged. If any tribe shall refuse to acknowledge the authority of the French by bowing down to the laced chapeau of Mowanna, let them abide the consequences of their obstinacy. Under cover," proceeds our author, "of a similar pretence, have the outrages and massacres at Tahiti the beautiful, the queen of the South Seas, been perpetrated."—*Residence in the Marquesas*, p. 18.

We cannot refrain from inserting the following anecdote.

"In the grounds of the famous missionary consul, Pritchard, then absent in London, the consular flag of Britain waved, as usual, during the day, from a lofty staff planted within a few yards of the beach, and in full view of the frigate. One morning, an officer at the head of a party of men, presented himself at the verandah of Mr. Pritchard's house, and inquired in broken English for the lady his wife. The matron soon made her appearance, and the polite Frenchman, making one of his best bows, and playing gracefully with the aiguillette that danced upon his breast, proceeded in courteous accents to deliver his mission. 'The admiral desired the flag to be hauled down,—hoped it would be perfectly agreeable,'—and his men stood ready to perform the duty. 'Tell the pirate your master,' replied the spirited Englishwoman, pointing to the staff, 'that if he wishes to strike those colours, he must come and perform the act himself. I will suffer no one else to do it.' The lady then bowed haughtily, and withdrew into the house. As the discomfited officer walked away, he looked up to the flag, and perceived that the cord by which it was elevated to its place, led from the top of the staff across the lawn to an open upper window of the mansion, where sat the lady from whom he had just parted, tranquilly engaged in knitting. Was that flag hauled down? Mrs. Pritchard thinks not, and Rear-Admiral Du Petit Thouars is believed to be of the same opinion."—*Typee*, p. 19.

But let us return to the Polynesians themselves. Almost the first fact related by Mr. Melville concerning the Marquesans, too sadly illustrates the truth of what we have before stated.

"We had approached within a mile and a half perhaps of the foot of the bay, when some of the islanders, who by this time had managed to scramble aboard of us at the risk of swamping their canoes, directed our attention to a singular commotion in the water ahead of the vessel. At first I imagined it to be produced by a shoal of fish sporting on the surface; but our savage friends assured us that it was caused by a shoal of 'whinhenies,' young girls, who in this manner were coming off to welcome us. As they drew nearer, and I watched the rising and sinking of their forms, and beheld the uplifted right arm bearing above the water the girdle of tappa, and their long dark hair trailing beside them as they swam, I almost fancied they could be nothing else than so many mermaids: and very like mermaids they behaved too.

"We were still some distance from the beach, and under slow headway, when we sailed right into the midst of these swimming nymphs, and they boarded us at every quarter, many seizing hold of the chainplates and springing into the chains, at the peril of being run over by the vessel in her course, catching at the bobstays, and wreathing their slender forms about the ropes hung suspended in the air. All of them at length succeeded in getting up the ship's side, where they clung, dripping with the brine, and glowing from the bath, their jet black

tresses streaming over their shoulders, and half enveloping their otherwise naked forms. There they hung, sparkling with savage vivacity, laughing gaily at one another, and chattering away with infinite glee. Nor were they idle the while, for each one performed the simple offices of the toilette for the other. Their luxuriant locks wound up, and twisted into the smallest possible compass, were freed from the briny element; the whole person carefully dried, and from a little round shell that passed from hand to hand, anointed with a fragrant oil; their adornments were completed by passing a few loose folds of white tappæ in a modest cincture around the waist. Thus arrayed, they no longer hesitated, but flung themselves lightly over the bulwarks, and were quickly frolicking about the decks. Many of them went forward perching upon the handrails, or running out upon the bowsprit, whilst others seated themselves upon the taffrail, or reclined at full length upon the boats. What a sight for us bachelor sailors! How avoid so dire a temptation? For who could think of tumbling these artless creatures overboard, when they had swam miles to welcome us? Their appearance perfectly amazed me; their extreme youth, the light clear brown of their complexions, their delicate features and inexpressibly graceful figures, their softly moulded limbs and free unstudied action, seemed as strange as beautiful. The 'Dolly' was fairly captured; and never will I say was vessel carried before by such a dashing and irresistible party of boarders. The ship taken, we could do no otherwise than yield ourselves prisoners, and for the whole period that she remained in the bay, the 'Dolly' as well as her crew were completely in the hands of the mermaids. In the evening, after we had come to an anchor, the deck was illuminated with lanterns, and this picturesque band of sylphs, decked out with flowers, and dressed in robes of variegated tappa, got up a ball in great style. These females are passionately fond of dancing, and in the wild grace and spirit of their style, excel every thing that I have ever seen. The varied dances of the Marquesan girls are beautiful in the extreme; but there is an abandoned voluptuousness in their character, which I dare not attempt to describe. Our ship was now wholly given up to every species of riot and debauchery. Not the feeblest barrier was interposed between the unholy passions of the crew and their unlimited gratification. The grossest licentiousness and the most shameful inebriety prevailed, with occasional but short-lived interruptions through the whole period of her stay. Alas! for the poor savages, when exposed to the influence of these polluting examples! Unsophisticated and confiding, they are easily led into every vice, and humanity weeps over the ruin thus remorselessly inflicted upon them by their European civilizers. Thrice happy are they, who, inhabiting some yet undiscovered island in the midst of the ocean, have never been brought into contaminating contact with the white man[2]!"—*Typee*, p. 15.

[2] Herman Melville to wit.—The strange mixture of genuine licentiousness and affected morality which this passage exhibits, is both painful and ludicrous.

During his stay at the Marquesas, Dr. Coulter had ample opportunity for seeing the native dances :—

" The situation generally chosen for the tabooa, or theatre, where these exhibitions take place, is some level spot of either rock or earth in the neighbourhood of some of these romantic streams, and often near a waterfall, surrounded by trees of rich foliage, the adjoining hills forming a curtain of green round it. In the centre of this is an enclosed portion of ground, covered by a smooth and varied-coloured pavement. The dancers perform on this. . . . . Their covering is only a small piece of native cloth, either round the waist or over the shoulders ; as the excitement of the dance increases even this disappears, or is flung wildly to the winds, and then you see neither a black nor a white man, but from the turmeric a golden yellow one, perfectly naked in all the wildness and frenzy of the heathen dance. They tire—others supply their places, and thus they keep going for hours ; their actions are all of the most vile that can be either invented or thought of ; no pen can or ought to describe it ; a veil ought to be cast over it, only to be lifted to disclose to the eyes of the sceptic the downright necessity for the presence of the Missionary, to throw the light of Christianity on the heathen mind, and have such scenes for ever obliterated from the thoughts of the Marquesan, as well as they have succeeded elsewhere." —*Coulter's Pacific*, p. 170.

This author speaks, too, of the loose conduct of the crews of ships, which occasionally visit them, and shows that the case of the " Dolly" is not a solitary instance, but a circumstance of nearly universal occurrence :—

" As soon as ever the anchor is down, if the ship is not a taboo, or restricted one, she will be at once boarded not by a few, but hundreds of women, who will not go on shore without being hunted overboard. Well, if the commander of the ship is ever so well inclined for good, the men will often knock off and do no work ; in this case the captain is in a distant sea, has no power to assist him in keeping rigid discipline on board, and has no other alternative but to submit, and get off as quick as he can ; but the reason I am so explicit is, that there are too many ships whose crews, from the captain to the cook, relax all discipline (as to morality) in other places as well as the Marquesas, and often in a few days will undo the anxious, unwearied, and zealous work of the Missionary for months."—p. 172.

In his second work, Dr. Coulter mentions the same degrading custom as prevailing at the Kingsmill Islands :—

" It is scarcely necessary for me to say, that these people are in the very depths of heathenism ; they give way to all sorts of barbarism and licentiousness ; and I feel sorry to have it to say, that the generality of ships touching here (mostly English and American whalers), so completely encourage this immorality and vileness, that it is now the

regular custom at the Kingsmill group. Whenever a ship drops her anchor, the first offering from the shore is a deck load of women. As soon as the 'Hound' let go her anchor, dozens of young women came alongside; and what appeared to be most horrible, was the fact of their being brought there by their fathers, mothers, and brothers."—Vol. i. p. 193.

In this particular instance, however, they were denied admission.

"Some," adds the author, "laughed immoderately at the disappointed looks of others, but most of them, though they hung round the vessel for a short time afterwards, went on shore in a very sulky mood."

Painful, however, as it is to reflect on the encouragement given to heathen licentiousness by nominal Christians, all such lesser sins fall into the shade compared with the outrage perpetrated by the French at Mahanar upon the peninsula of Taraiboo, in the *Christian* island of Tahiti:—

"The fight," says Mr. Melville, "originated in the seizure of a number of women from the shore by men belonging to one of the French vessels of war. In this affair the islanders fought desperately, killing about fifty of the enemy, and losing ninety of their own number. The French sailors and marines, who at the time were reported to be infuriated with liquor, gave no quarter; and the survivors only saved themselves by fleeing to the mountains."—*Omoo*, p. 127.

Yes, this is the way in which the subjects of the most Christian king endeavour to improve the imperfect Christianity of the Tahitians—thus do they seek to prove by example, as well as precept, the superiority of popery to puritanism—such is the security of *person*, as well as property, they would wish to establish in the isles of the Pacific—thus would they extend the influence of the "*œuvre de la foi*," and sacrifice at the shrine of their devotion the two costliest of all offerings,—the life of man and the chastity of woman. A deep sympathy—a righteous and a holy indignation is *felt, and acted upon, too*—when we hear of similar outrages perpetrated by Moslem oppressors on their Christian subjects. Shall the sympathy of Russia be exerted to rescue the Rayah from the infidels of Turkey, whilst the sympathy of England is not able to protect the Kannaka from the infidels of France? Shame on the thought; God has given us power to protect the innocent against the wicked, the weak against the strong; let us use that power, lest, in His retributive justice, He deliver our homes to pollution, and our hearth-stones to blood. It was the saying of Napoleon, that if he once landed here, though he could not conquer England, he would make it unfit for Englishmen to dwell in—words of fearful import in the

mouth of a Frenchman. It is God alone who has preserved our land from the fate of Prussia and of Spain; let us secure the continuance of that protection by protecting those from robbery and wrong who have the courage but not the power to protect themselves [3].

But let us return to Nukuheva, from which we have wandered, it must be allowed, to some distance. Mr. Melville having, as we suppose, in the first instance run away to sea—he does not say so—but the superiority of his education, and other circumstances, lead us to infer as much—became tired of the "Dolly" and her captain, and determined on leaving the vessel. Another sailor, whose *nom de guerre* is TOBY, agreed to join him, and they determined on escaping to the interior, and concealing themselves in the valley of HAPPAR, until the "Dolly" should have departed, intending then to return to Nukuheva, and embark in some more agreeable vessel. They accomplished their escape with no great difficulty, and succeeded in reaching the mountains, but here an unexpected difficulty awaited them. The various valleys of the island are inhabited by independent and hostile tribes—one of these, called "Happar," was considered as particularly friendly to Europeans; another, named "Typee," was spoken of as very much the reverse, and, added to this, their very name was said to signify—"*Lover of human flesh.*" Where all are cannibals,—as the Marquesans undoubtedly are,—such an appellation does not perhaps matter much,—and yet there is, it must be allowed, something unpleasant in it. The two fugitives, after enduring some hardships for three or four days in the mountains, descended into a beautiful valley, and found themselves, to their great dismay, in the territory of the famous man-eaters abovementioned. They were not, however, devoured, it being the custom of these islanders only to eat their enemies slain in battle; on the contrary, they were treated with extreme kindness; the only disagreeable circumstance connected with their stay being that they were not permitted to depart; but whilst allowed the free range of the upper and central parts of the valley, carefully watched and forbidden to approach the sea. We do not wonder, however, at the sensations of fear which they experienced, after all that they had heard concerning the character and conduct of the tribe in question:—

"Even before visiting the Marquesas," says Mr. Melville, "I had heard from men who had touched at the group on former voyages, some

[3] "The great body of the people, as well as their queen, confidently relied upon the speedy interposition of England, a nation bound to them by many ties, and which, more than once, had solemnly guaranteed their independence."—*Omoo*, p. 126.

revolting stories in connexion with these savages; and fresh in my remembrance was the adventure of the master of the "Catherine," who only a few months previous, imprudently venturing into this bay in an armed boat for the purpose of barter, was seized by the natives, carried back a little distance into their valley, and was only saved from a cruel death by the intervention of a young girl, who facilitated his escape by night along the beach to Nukuheva.

"I had heard, too, of an English vessel, that many years ago, after a weary cruise, sought to enter the bay of Nukuheva, and arriving within two or three miles of the land, was met by a large canoe full of natives, who offered to lead the way to the place of their destination. The captain, unacquainted with the localities of the island, joyfully acceded to the proposition, the canoe paddled on, and the ship followed. She was soon conducted to a beautiful inlet, and dropped her anchor in its waters beneath the shadows of the lofty shore. That same night the perfidious Typees, who had thus inveigled her into their fatal bay, flocked aboard the doomed vessel by hundreds, and at a given signal murdered every one on board."—*Typee*, p. 26.

We read such tales as these with lively interest and deep horror; our warmest sympathy is awakened for the unfortunate European; our keenest indignation is aroused towards the cruel and faithless savage; whilst, perhaps, our anger is softened by pity for the benighted condition of the poor heathen, who violates the rights of hospitality and the very laws of nature; and the whole process concludes with a vivid perception of our own superiority over the people that know not God, and our lips almost breathe the accents of the Pharisee, "Lord, I thank Thee, that I am not such as these."

And yet, were we to examine the case more minutely, we should find little cause for exultation; the treachery, the cruelty, so often exercised by the uncultivated natives towards the white man, originates in every case in wanton outrages first perpetrated on the unsuspecting barbarians by Europeans; the natives who have welcomed the strangers and their big canoe as messengers from heaven, are treated by their polished guests with unprincipled baseness, or unprovoked barbarity, and naturally, nor can we well say unjustly, make fierce reprisals on the next pale-faced strangers who approach their shores. It is true, that the innocent thus often suffer for the guilty, that the honest trader loses by the fraud of his predecessor, and the murderer escapes unharmed, leaving a debt of massacre to be settled by the peaceful and humane. But there is nothing in this which is at variance with the general dispensations of Providence; nothing which in reality forms any aggravated stain on the character of the Polynesian. It was "the meek usurper's holy head" which atoned for the blood-stained treason of Henry

of Bolingbroke; it was the only too-gentle Louis XVI. who suffered for the accumulated enormities of the foulest race of unredeemed miscreants that ever sat upon a throne, to curse earth, or outrage heaven. And as to the rationale of the Kannaka's conduct, he is placed in a state of war with the powerful foreigners, and makes his reprisals how and where he can :—

"The enormities practised in the South Seas upon some of the inoffensive islanders well nigh pass belief. These things are seldom proclaimed at home; they happen at the very ends of the earth; they are done in a corner, and there is none to reveal them. But there is, nevertheless, many a petty trader that has navigated the Pacific, whose course from island to island might be traced by a series of cold-blooded robberies, kidnappings, and murders, the iniquity of which might be considered almost sufficient to sink her guilty timbers to the bottom of the sea. . . . . How often is the term "savages" incorrectly applied! None really deserving of it were ever yet discovered by voyagers or by travellers; they have discovered heathens and barbarians, whom by horrible cruelties they have exasperated into savages. It may be asserted, without fear of contradiction, that in all the cases of outrages committed by Polynesians, Europeans have at some time or other been the aggressors, and that the cruel and blood-thirsty disposition of some of the islanders is mainly to be ascribed to the influence of such examples."—*Typee*, p. 28.

Dr. Coulter confirms this statement: besides remarks of the same effect with reference to more westerly groups of islands, speaking of the Marquesas, he observes :—

"I have known also ships go into the islands, get a supply of one or two hundred bags, with vegetables, &c., all the time of trading the ship lying off and on; and when the last boat came alongside, hoist her up, crowd on all sail, and the chiefs who came for their payment in powder, muskets, &c., hunted over the side, and made even swim to the nearest land, or canoe that kept near the ship. Now, what is the consequence of all this? The next vessel which arrives belonging to the same nation, often gets its boats cut off, and the crews killed, and generally eaten, from the feeling of revenge for former insult and injury—they, of course, trading with more honesty and confidence, and placing themselves more incautiously in the power of the natives."—*Coulter's Pacific*, p. 174.

After speaking of an instance in which an English captain fired at some harmless natives, without any provocation, because they shook their spears at him from the shore, when he, being in a boat, wished to hold intercourse with them. Mr. Melville adds :—

"Wanton acts of cruelty, like this, are not unusual on the part of sea-captains landing at islands comparatively unknown. Even at the Pomota group, but a day's sail from Tahiti, the islanders coming down

to the shore, have several times been fired at by trading schooners passing through their narrow channels; and this, too, as a mere amusement on the part of the ruffians. Indeed, it is almost incredible, the light in which many sailors regard these naked heathens. They hardly consider them human. But it is a curious fact, that the more ignorant and degraded men are, the more contemptuously they look upon those whom they deem their inferiors."—*Omoo*, p. 24.

The hostility of the Typees to white men appears to have originated in the unprovoked aggression of Lieutenant Porter, who having been hospitably treated by the people of Nukuheva and Happar, assisted them in an attack upon these their hereditary enemies:—

"Valiantly, although with much loss, the Typees disputed every inch of ground, and after some hard fighting obliged their assailants to retreat and abandon their design of conquest. The invaders, on their march back to the sea, consoled themselves for their repulse by setting fire to every house and temple in their route; and a long line of smoking ruins defaced the once-smiling bosom of the valley, and proclaimed to its Pagan inhabitants the spirit which reigned in the breasts of Christian soldiers. Who can wonder at the deadly hatred of the Typees to all foreigners after such unprovoked atrocities?"—*Typee*, p. 27.

Nor need we wonder that the two white men felt but ill at ease when they discovered their mistake. Toby succeeded in making his escape about a month after their arrival there, and was carried to sea against his will by an American whaler, thus leaving his companion to his fate; whilst Tommo, as our author was entitled by his hosts, remained about four months in an easy captivity, receiving every kindness, and tasting every pleasure which the valley afforded. The king Mehevi took him under his especial protection; a native of inferior rank, Kory-Kory by name, was appointed to wait upon and take care of him, and, for he was lame from a complaint caught in the mountain, to carry him from place to place; he was billeted on a kind old chief, Marheyo by name, and treated with courtesy and respect by all the other chiefs; and besides the frequent society of the damsels of the valley, his constant companion in his rambles was the charming and beautiful Fayaway, a maiden of the most perfect symmetry of form and feature; the most winning grace of action and manner; and, as far as their imperfect medium of communicating ideas could enable him to judge, of a warm heart and refined mind.

The place, from his account, appears to have been such a perfect Elysium, that we wonder at his extreme desire to get away

from it. He exhibits, indeed, much zeal and skill in the comparisons which he draws between the state of these simple natives and that of the half-civilized inhabitants of other islands, or the fully-civilized Europeans themselves :—

" In a primitive state of society, the enjoyments of life, though few and simple, are spread over a great extent, and are unalloyed; but civilization, for every advantage she imparts, holds a hundred evils in reserve; the heart-burnings, the jealousies, the social rivalries, the family dissensions, and the thousand self-inflicted discomforts of refined life, which make up in units the swelling aggregate of human misery, are unknown among these unsophisticated people."—*Typee*, p. 38.

Very true, though the writer does not seem to us to understand the rationale of the case. The world,—that is to say, the system of feeling and action which, making self its idol, endeavours to consecrate to the service of its false god all the gifts of nature, and all the discoveries of art, is at enmity with God, and therefore lies under His curse ; but independent of this, *it is a mistake*, it does not take the right means of obtaining that which it aims at—happiness. For happiness consists in the full, the legitimate, and the rightly-proportioned exercise of all the impulses, the sentiments, and the faculties of our composite natures; it is, in fact, the fulfilment of the end of our existence. This cannot be perfectly obtained in our fallen state; but any approach to it must consist in an approximation to the ideal of man and of society, as they would have been, had our first parents not fallen, and had they and their children carried out and realized the design of their Creator. The Gospel, so far as it is carried into effect, elevates man to this state, both individually and socially; individually, by restoring him in a certain degree to the image of God, in which he was first created; socially, so far as the Church system is carried out—not the Church system as it is now, or has been, at any time—but the Church system as it exists in the mind of its Author, and as it is faintly, but still gloriously, shadowed forth in the lives and deaths of the first Christians—for the Church is the revival of the primeval form of the Creation.

The world, on the other hand, seeking to be wise in the ways of selfishness, becomes foolish in those of happiness ; and though acute and powerful minds amongst those who dwell in it may so far perceive a portion of the truth as to see the hollowness and the worthlessness of the system of which they form part, still their voices are raised in vain, or more probably attack some flimsy outwork, some subordinate detail, and leave the *plan* untouched ; so that despite of its moralists, economists, philosophers, and sentimentalists, the world proceeds to develop its

folly and its misery, with a full reliance on its wisdom, and a strange delusion of its excellence—its power to bestow happiness.

In a savage state, man, though equally blind, has not such an inordinate over-appreciation of his own powers of sight; he follows certain laws of his nature; and though the laws of a corrupt and an erring nature, they still bear traces of the once-bright original; and in simply following the dictates of his heart, and the impulses of his instinct, man gains far more than in searching out his own inventions, and acting according to rules of his own laying down; in the one case, he follows laws which have once been good, builds on foundations whose massive rocks attest their former strength; in the other, he produces, in his already-weakened and fallen state, rules which represent not his nature, even in its corrupted state, but its actual corruption; he gathers together chaff, and builds up an edifice on the sand.

The system of savage life is nearer nature, and therefore nearer God, than that of the world, and consequently offers, *ceteris paribus*, greater facilities for happiness.

Alas! how little is this understood! how often do we talk of the triumph of civilization and enlightenment when the metamorphosed Indians have relinquished the true gems of their simple existence for the vain baubles of artificial life; the blessings of a primitive state of society for the curse of a cumbrous and senseless conventionalism! how often are those outward signs which really betoken the deep-rooted evils of our own social system, our feebleness of thought, and our fallacy in judgment! how often are they taken as the signs of increasing refinement, the symptoms and the effects of advancing Christianity! The missionary who would do most good, would be one who should alter not the customs, but the morals of the Polynesians; and endeavour, wherever such were possible, to give a Christian character to their existing institutions, rather than to treat as a weed every fair plant and goodly tree which had not been produced in the hot-bed of European civilization.

But let us return to the valley of Typee. The harmony subsisting amongst the members of this simple community appears truly astonishing:—

"In this secluded abode of happiness, there were no cross old women, no cruel stepdames, no withered spinsters, no love-sick maidens, no sour old bachelors, no inattentive husbands, no melancholy young men, no blubbering youngsters, and no squalling brats [this appears the most incredible of all]. All was mirth, fun, and high good humour. Blue devils, hypochondria, and doleful dumps, went and hid themselves among the crannies of the rocks. Here you would see a

parcel of children frolicking together the livelong day, and no quarrelling, no contention among them. The same number in our own land could not have played together for the space of an hour without biting or scratching one another. There, too, you might have seen a throng of young females, not filled with envyings of each others' charms, nor displaying the ridiculous affectations of gentility, nor yet moving in whalebone corsets like so many automatons, but free, inartificially happy, and unconstrained."—*Typee*, p. 140.

The causes of this state of things are various, besides the general law which we have already laid down. The exquisite beauty of their climate has, no doubt, a vast influence; the easy attainment of all the necessaries and enjoyments of life, with which they are acquainted, is another; the absence of all temptation to envy is a third; and Mr. Melville considers their crowning advantage to be the non-existence of money. There are however, we apprehend, two other reasons for this state of things, the one pre-eminently a blessing; the other, still more fearfully, a curse.

The first of these is, that the *form* of the Typee community, their constitution, if we may so speak, is about the most perfect that exists on the face of the earth, though from several indications it would seem to be on the decline. The whole clan are of one blood, and they never forget it. The supreme chief, or king, as in common with our author we will call him, possesses a decided supremacy, together with a limited monarchy; the chiefs, though highly reverenced by the people, and decidedly raised above them, are not separated by any obnoxious or impassable barrier; the commonalty enjoy freedom without licence, and practice obedience without servility. The position of the women, too, whatever defects there may be in the relation between the sexes, is not that of slaves but companions; and the priesthood, whilst enjoying high privileges and exclusive authority in religious matters, is neither able nor desirous of exercising any tyrannical power or undue influence over the laity, whilst these accord to them, without demur, their natural position.

This looks like a fiction of the fancy; but let any one read "Typee," and he will see that our inferences are minutely borne out by Mr. Melville's statements, though he has not come to the same definite conclusions.

The other reason for the contented state of the Typee valley is, that its inmates have apparently no fear of future punishment; their conduct is regulated by rules which are sanctioned by universal assent, and conscience has been schooled, by the teaching of successive generations, to remain silent where she cannot command.

The *Typees*, however, make up for their domestic unanimity by their bitter and constant hostility to the tribes of Happar and Nukuheva; but this we cannot think derogatory to them, and certainly it does not show them to be either cruel or quarrelsome by nature.

The intercourse between the sexes would appear to be under very lax regulations, though on this point Mr. Melville's "*delicacy*" leaves us somewhat in the dark, whilst his inuendoes allow us to imagine almost any thing that we please, without making any definite or tangible statement. Their marriage-law is peculiar, and as disgusting as peculiar:—

"A regular system of polygamy exists among the islanders, but of a most extraordinary nature,—a plurality of husbands instead of wives. . . . . The girls are first wooed and won, at a very tender age, by some stripling in the household in which they reside. This, however, is a mere frolic of the affections, and no formal engagement is contracted. By the time this first love has a little subsided, a second suitor presents himself, of graver years, and carries both boy and girl away to his own habitation. This disinterested and generous-hearted fellow now weds the young couple—marrying damsel and lover at the same time—and all three thenceforth live as harmoniously as so many turtles. . . . . No man has more than one wife, and no woman of mature years has less than two husbands; sometimes she has three, but such instances are not frequent. The marriage tie, whatever it may be, does not appear to be indissoluble; for separations occasionally happen."—*Typee*, p. 213.

A married woman—by which, we presume, our author means one who has married her *second* husband—is distinguished by being tattooed on her right hand and left foot. Previously to this, the girls have only two small dots on the upper lip.

The laws of the taboo, or restrictive enactments of the valley, sanctioned by the local religion, are singular and various; and their intention sometimes evidently here, as elsewhere, grounded on motives of policy, sometimes unintelligible, reminds us of the ancient Egyptian superstitions. Thus women are forbidden to enter canoes; men to touch the material of women's garments whilst being made; and certain animals are protected by the taboo; and by the same authority, females are restrained from coming within the precincts of the *Hoolah-Hoolah*, or sacred groves.

Of the religion of the Typees we gain but scanty and superficial information from the work before us; the accounts, indeed, of some of their festivals and ceremonies are curious and interesting, but on almost every occasion the writer acknowledges himself unable to explain the meaning of what he saw.

After speaking of a festival, which, from a heap of those articles, he entitles "The Feast of Calabashes," he adds:—

"In vain I questioned Kory-Kory, and others of the natives, as to the meaning of the strange things that were going on; all their explanations were conveyed in such a mass of outlandish gibberish and gesticulations, that I gave up the attempt in despair. All that day the drums resounded, the priests chanted, and the multitude feasted and roared till sunset, when the throng dispersed, and the taboo-groves were again abandoned to quiet and repose."—*Typee*, p. 187.

He mentions one custom of their chanting every evening for more than half-an-hour together, in a solemn monotonous manner, and suggests that this ceremony might be their family worship.

The inhabitants of the valley believed in a future state, of this there is no doubt, but little more can be gleaned of their faith; they had hideous wooden idols, to which they offered fruit, &c. Whether the author's scanty information on these subjects arose from indifference to such matters in general, or from ignorance of the language, we cannot say. The notion never seems, for a moment, to have entered his head, either during his stay there, or after its conclusion, that he might have attempted to enlighten the minds of his hosts on "temperance, righteousness, and judgment to come;" and that Providence, in giving him the opportunity of doing this, saddled him with a heavy responsibility.

His notices of some ancient remains, apparently the work of an earlier race, are extremely curious.

"One day . . . . I came upon a scene which reminded me of Stonehenge, and the architectural labours of the Druid. At the base of one of the mountains, and surrounded on all sides by dense groves, a series of vast terraces of stone rises, step by step, for a considerable distance up the hill-side. These terraces cannot be less than one hundred yards in length and twenty in width. Their magnitude, however, is less striking, than the immense size of the blocks composing them. Some of the stones, of an oblong shape, are from ten to fifteen feet in length, and five or six feet thick. Their sides are quite smooth, but though square, and of pretty regular formation, they bear no mark of the chisel. They are laid together without cement, and here and there show gaps between. The topmost terrace and the lower one are somewhat peculiar in their construction. They have both a quadrangular depression in the centre, leaving the rest of the terrace elevated several feet above it. In the intervals of the stones immense trees have taken root, and their broad boughs stretching far over, and interlacing together, support a canopy almost impenetrable to the sun. Overgrowing the greater part of them, and climbing from one to another, is a wilderness of vines, in whose sinewy embrace many of the stones lie half

hidden, while in some places a thick growth of bushes entirely covers them. There is a wild pathway which obliquely crosses two of these terraces; and so profound is the shade, so dense the vegetation, that a stranger to the place might pass along it without being aware of their existence. These structures bear every indication of a very high antiquity, and Kory-Kory, who was my authority in all matters of scientific research, gave me to understand that they were coeval with the creation of the world; that the great gods themselves were the builders; and that they would endure until time shall be no more. Kory-Kory's prompt explanation, and his attributing the work to a divine origin, at once convinced me that neither he nor the rest of his countrymen knew any thing about them. As I gazed upon this monument, doubtless the work of an extinct and forgotten race, thus buried in the green nook of an island at the ends of the earth, the existence of which was yesterday unknown, a stronger feeling of awe came over me than if I had stood musing at the mighty base of the pyramid of Cheops. There are no inscriptions, no sculpture, no clue, by which to conjecture its history: nothing but the dumb stones. How many generations of those majestic trees which overshadow them, have grown, and flourished, and decayed since first they were erected!

* * * * * * *

"I have already mentioned that the dwellings of the islanders were almost invariably built upon massive stone foundations, which they called 'Pi-pi-s.' The dimensions of these, however, as well as of the stones composing them, are comparatively small: but there are other and larger erections of a similar description, comprising the 'Morais,' or burying-grounds, and festival places, in nearly all the valleys of the island. Some of these piles are so extensive, and so great a degree of labour and skill must have been requisite in constructing them, that I can scarcely believe they were built by the ancestors of the present inhabitants. If indeed they were, the race has sadly deteriorated in their knowledge of the mechanic arts. To say nothing of their habitual indolence, by what contrivance within the reach of so simple a people could such enormous masses have been moved or fixed in their places? And how could they with their rude implements have chiselled and hammered them into shape? All of these larger 'Pipis,' like that of the Hoolah-Hoolah ground in the Typee valley, bore incontestable marks of great age; and I am disposed to believe that their erection may be ascribed to the same race of men who were the builders of the still more ancient remains I have just described."—*Typee*, pp. 172—174.

This, indeed, opens a wide field for speculation, especially when we recollect the sculptured remains discovered by many of the earlier navigators in these seas. But we have already remained long enough in this valley, and must proceed elsewhere, leaving our readers to form what conjectures they please regarding the origin of these venerable monuments of a long-forgotten age.

Omoo takes up Mr. Melville's narrative where Typee left it, namely, at the point of his escape from the beautiful valley of that name; we do not wonder at the glowing colours in which its simple natives present themselves to his eyes, when compared with the company into which he afterwards fell. His shipmates seem to have been a singularly bad set, especially one thoroughly unprincipled scoundrel whom he calls Doctor Long Ghost; and from some cause or other, he has scarcely a good word to say for any individual, either of European or Polynesian extraction, with whom he came in contact during the period described in this work. After various adventures he reaches Tahiti, where he is confined sometime in an easy durance, for joining with the rest of the crew in refusing to work the vessel in which he had embarked; the right of the case we do not pretend to decide.

The efforts of the missionaries there he declares to be utterly fruitless, except in having abolished idolatry and infanticide; but he rather takes them under his wing as well-meaning men, devoid of tact, taste, or judgment, and particularly liable to imposition. According to his account, he only met with *one* native Christian in the whole group. We must however observe, that we neither think himself and his comrades likely to have become acquainted with any Christians, nor particularly capable of testing their Christianity, nor does it appear to us probable that, as a general rule, any intercourse between him and the natives would have a tendency to exalt either their principles or their practice; we may do him wrong, but if so it is his own fault.

He is, however, extremely impartial: his account of the Romish priests, two French and one Irish, from whom he received great kindness, is by no means such as to raise their character for either piety or purity. We cannot help thinking, that he must be wrong in this instance; for well as we know from our own personal observation, the practical evils of a celibate clergy in Italy, Portugal, and France, it is not the custom of the Roman Church uselessly to expose itself to such a charge as that of sending out three profligate hypocrites to convert an island already occupied by the zealous and respectable emissaries of a Protestant sect. The thing strikes us as absurd.

His account, by the way, of a French frigate and her crew is very interesting: the perfection of the wood-work, and the inefficiency of the human part of the arrangement is very curious; "it is to be hoped," he adds, "that they are not building their ships for the people across the channel to take." The French, he tells us elsewhere, are "no favourites,—throughout Polynesia."

Leaving Tahiti for the island of Eimeo, (after serving some

time on a plantation, owned by an American and a cockney, both men of no education, and hunting wild cattle by way of change,) Melville and Long Ghost proceeded to Tamai, an inland village situated on the borders of a small lake. The following extract, though highly interesting, is, we think, sufficient to condemn the author to far more than *earthly* shame and contempt.

"The people of Tamai were nominally Christians; but being remote from ecclesiastical jurisdiction, their religion sat lightly upon them. We had been told even, that many heathenish games and dances still lingered in their valley. Now the prospect of seeing an old-fashioned 'Heva,' or Tahitian reel, was one of the inducements which brought us here; and so finding Rartoo rather liberal in his religious ideas, we disclosed our desires. . . . . It was a wide dreary space, lighted up by a full moon. . . . . Near the trees on one side of the clear space was a ruinous pile of stones, many rods in extent; upon which had formerly stood a temple of Oro. At present there was nothing but a rude hut, planted on the lowermost terrace. It seemed to have been used as a '*Tappa Herree*,' or house for making the native cloth. Here we saw light gleaming from between the bamboos, and casting long rod-like shadows upon the ground; without, voices also were heard. We went up, and had a peep at the dancers who were getting ready for the ballet. They were some twenty in number, waited upon by hideous old crones, who might have been duennas. Long Ghost proposed to send the latter packing; but Rartoo said, it would never do, and so they were permitted to remain. We tried to effect an entrance at the door, but after a noisy discussion with one of the old witches within, our guide became fidgety, and at last told us to desist, or we would spoil all. He then led us off to a distance, to await the performance, as the girls, he said, did not wish to be recognized. He furthermore made us promise to remain where we were until all was over and the dancers had retired. We waited impatiently, and at last they came forth. They were arrayed in short tunics of white tappa; with garlands of flowers on their heads. Following them were the duennas, who remained clustering about the house, while the girls advanced a few paces; and in an instant, two of them, taller than their companions, were standing side by side, in the middle of a ring, formed by the clasped hands of the rest. This movement was made in perfect silence. Presently the two girls join hands over head; and crying out, 'Ahloo! ahloo!' wave them to and fro. Upon which the ring begins to circle slowly, the dancers moving sideways with their arms a little drooping. Soon they quicken their pace; and, at last, fly round and round; bosoms heaving, hair streaming, flowers drooping, and every sparkling eye circling in what seemed a line of light. Meanwhile, the pair within are passing and repassing each other incessantly. Inclining sideways, so that their long hair falls far over, they glide this way and that, one foot continually in the air and their fingers thrown forth, and twirling in the moonbeams. 'Ahloo! ahloo!' again cry

the dance queens; and coming together in the middle of the ring, they once more lift up the arch and stand motionless. 'Ahloo! ahloo!' every link of the circle is broken; and the girls, deeply breathing, stand perfectly still. They pant hard and fast a moment or two; and then, just as the deep flush is dying away from their faces, slowly recede all round; thus enlarging the ring. Again the two leaders wave their hands, when the rest pause; and now far apart, stand in the still moonlight like a circle of fairies. Presently raising a strange chant, they softly sway themselves, gradually quickening the movement, until, at length, for a few passionate moments, with throbbing bosoms and glowing cheeks, they abandon themselves to all the spirit of the dance, apparently lost to every thing around, but soon subsiding again into the same languid measure as before, they become motionless; and then reeling forward on all sides, their eyes swimming in their heads, join in one wild chorus, and sink into each others' arms—such is the Lory-Lory, I think they call it: the dance of the backsliding girls of Tamai."—*Omoo*, pp. 241—243.

It is with a feeling of relief that we bid farewell to the pages of Mr. Herman Melville, calculated as we believe them to be, to lower the tone of thought and feeling of all those who are carried away by the liveliness and good nature of their author, especially the young, and return once more to the racy and altogether delightful narrative of Dr. Coulter.

After a series of highly interesting adventures in South America and California, he left the latter country (where he had remained for his health) as guest on board the "Hound," Captain Trainer: proceeding westward, they at length reached the Kingsmill Islands, a group fourteen in number, lying between 4° north and 6° south latitude, and 172° and 178° east longitude.

"Some of the smaller islands are bare enough looking, with only scanty groups of cocoa-nut and pandanus trees; whilst others are thickly covered with thick groves, and even much underbrush, which present a very inviting aspect when near to them. Occasional coral reefs defend the shores from the swell of the sea, and some have considerable lagoons inside them, where boats can enter or even a small vessel lie safe enough, as far as regards her anchorage. However, few would be found so imprudent as to trust boat or vessel of any size into these lagoons, where they would only be surrounded by swarms of treacherous natives."—Vol. i. p. 236.

The number of inhabitants he estimates at forty thousand—both men and women are good looking, and not much darker than the inhabitants of Tahiti and the Marquesas; they are however very treacherous, and their designs upon European vessels are often organized by white men, the outcasts of Chris-

tendom, who have become domesticated among them. These men are generally either runaway convicts from Sydney or deserters from whaling vessels, and soon lose every thing of civilization except the additional capacity of mischief. They are, of course, careful to conceal themselves from their countrymen, and are therefore seldom seen or recognized. An Englishman going among the natives of either this or any other of these groups is almost sure to rise high in command; thus, at New Ireland, one was found as prime-minister to a king—at New Guinea, another had become supreme chief of a powerful tribe.

"The natives of the Kingsmill Islands have a singular superstition, that all vessels that are placed in their power are sent to them by their gods, and they are consequently in the habit of eating their crews when feasible—an unpleasant propensity it must be allowed." He did not observe here "any trace of idols or images of any kind. There appeared to be no worship or adoration of any thing in particular, neither had they any definite idea of an hereafter." . . . .

Polygamy is practised amongst them to a great extent.

"Licentiousness and treachery are the prominent features in the character of these savages; and it is deeply to be regretted that the periodical visits of whale ships and others encourage gross immorality on the one hand, whilst on the other, by the commission of outrageous acts, they stimulate these heathens to treacherous revenge."—p. 213.

At Utiroo, an old chief, of the name of Wowma, came off to the vessel in a canoe.

"He was in the usual costume of the natives, that is, a small fine matting (made of the fibres of the cocoa-nut husk) round his loins, and another of coarser texture thrown over his shoulders, after the fashion of a mantle. It was quite evident that he and 'Tainey,' as he called the captain, were old acquaintances, and he renewed his friendship in the usual manner of this group of islands, that is, by taking a little congealed cocoa-nut oil out of a small gourd that was suspended from his left arm, and anointed the captain by rubbing it on his face. I was next introduced to old Wowma as a great man and passenger with him, and served in the same manner. . . . . The first and second mates were also oiled, and then we were considered, as the old man said, 'all right,' that is, his friends, and under his protection. . . . . The oil or grease with which the chiefs anoint, or rather mark their friends, is of different colours, caused by mixing up with it earths of various shades which exist on parts of the island. Sometimes pulverized charcoal or lampblack is used, so that each chief has his particular colour; and any stranger bearing on his face either white, black, brown,

red, &c., is under the protection of the chief whose colour he wears. Wowma's mark was red, and each of us bearing the marks of his four fingers and thumb, drawn from our forehead to our chin down the face, presented certainly a very comical appearance, the effect being much increased by each laughing at the other."—Vol. i. p. 197.

Thus protected, Dr. Coulter landed, and was treated with great hospitality by a young chief of the name of Hoonoo; amongst other things he procured "half a dozen young and well-looking girls," as wives for him during his stay. Our friend had great difficulty in making them believe that he did not wish for their society, and at last was obliged to leave them in possession of the hut which his host had obtained for him, and take refuge in the abode of the young chief.

He made an excursion here, during which he was stripped of his clothing; nor did the "Hound" leave these islands without an attempt, on the part of the natives, to possess themselves of the vessel and the live stock on board.

Proceeding still further west they reached New Ireland, where they were well received. The inhabitants of this island are of the Papuan race.

"The colour of their skins perfectly black; the hair of the head woolley and naturally black, but with most of them artificially white, with a quantity of chalk rubbed into it: but the form and features were very fine. . . . ."

After Captain Trainer had contrived to explain to the natives, by signs, that he wished to trade with them, the king approached the vessel in a canoe.

"He was a fine, tall, middle-aged man, of most commanding appearance, black as a coal. Some of his front teeth were stained red; and round his wrist, ankles, and neck, strings of fancifully formed bone and shell ornaments were dangling. His features were truly noble; but there was no covering on his person except a small mat of fine texture, fancifully adorned with red feathers, round his loins."—Vol. i. p. 243.

With him was an Englishman of the name of Thomas Manners, a native of London, who, having become tired of a seafaring life, and having no friends alive, had requested a whale ship in which he was serving, to land him here some ten years before. He had no reason to regret his decision, being kindly treated by the people.

"In fact, he ranked high, and had nearly as much authority over the natives as the king had. He was a middle-sized man, of stout

athletic make, and his eye and aspect generally was bold and determined. His long dark hair, which would hang down on his shoulders, was coiled up on the top of his head, and made fast there by a rude kind of tortoise-shell comb. His beard was long, and rested on his chest. The fine matting he wore was hanging from his shoulders, after the manner of a cloak or mantle; encircling his neck was a fine cord formed by the platting or twisting together of cocoa-nut fibre; from it was suspended a curiously carved shell ornament, as large as an oyster. This was his badge of rank, presented to him by the sable monarch now on board. It conferred on him, I may say, absolute authority over the lower class of natives."—p. 245.

Having thus found an interpreter, the English struck up a brisk intercourse with the natives, and Dr. Coulter landed under the protection of the king Boolooma and the prince his son Rownaa, a very fine and high-spirited young warrior.

"The tabooing or rendering my person and property sacred from the hostile touch of any of his sable majesty's subjects, was performed in the following manner:—From the folds of cloth round his loins he extracted some cocoa-nut fibre sinnet which was stained red, and tied two pieces of it firmly round the stock of the gun; another piece encircled my neck as a necklace, having strung on it a small piece of pearl shell. All the time he was arranging these (to me) important matters, a continual chant of a low guttural kind was kept up by his worthy son."

The prince is thus described:—

"He was as black as his father. The hair of his head was not so carefully combed out, but matted, and stood out in points about ten or twelve inches long from his scalp, something after the manner of the long quills from the skin of an enraged porcupine; it was like all the rest of the warriors here, powdered with chalk or lime. He appeared to be about five or six-and-twenty years old, stoutly made, and of the middle height. He had also a badge of rank made of a pearl oyster shell suspended from his neck, and glistening from his black native chest. Two of his front teeth were died black, and two more adjoining red. A mere apology for a covering encircled his loins. In his hand he bore a short, heavy, partially carved paddle, which had three or four large tufts of human hair dangling from it."

During his excursion on shore, he became involved in a war, going on between Boolooma's people and an adjoining tribe. The expedition—the rescue of four warriors just about to be eaten—the retreat to the mountains before a superior force, and the final repulse of the enemy are described in a most vivid manner, and we regret much the not being able to transfer them to our pages.

Polygamy and cannibalism prevail here to an immense extent—the chiefs have great power, and are very popular—the head

chief or king frequently interferes to arrange the domestic concerns of the subjects.

"For instance, if a lazy fellow has a wife or two, and a few children, and through his love for fishing, dancing, and loitering idly about, neglects to bring in the necessary supplies for his family, a complaint is made, the chief visits the house in person, and if he sees just cause for punishment, he orders out the whole population of the village; men, women, and children, arm themselves with a stiff birch made of small canes; they then form a long double line about six feet apart, and wait with anxious glee the approach of the delinquent. At last he is placed at one end of the lines, amidst a shower of yells, screams, gibes, &c. The word is given by the chief, and away he darts, at his utmost speed, through the ranks, every one endeavouring to hit him as he passes. According to his deserts, he may get off with running the line once, or may have to do so twice or thrice; but he is skilled in running and fleetness that can run the lines even once, without having his skin tickled for him by the hearty application of the birch, wielded by some strong women. As the punishment is not of a fatal kind, the whole affair creates unrestricted merriment. If the victim is a smart fellow, he may escape with few blows; but if he is heavy, sulky, and dogged, he pays for it. Such a man comes off covered with welds on his bare skin, from his head to his heels. For one month afterwards his family are provided for by the public at large, under the fatherly superintendence of the chief. At the expiration of that time, if he has all his domestic matters in perfect order, as a good father and provident husband ought to have, he again resumes his place in society, and shortly afterwards perhaps helps, with an experienced hand, to flagellate some one else. If any man, from his faults and habits, becomes constantly annoying to society, he is expelled from his tribe and district; and if he joins another one, he does so at a disadvantage, being received only as a degraded man, he will get no wife to be his companion, and the children will scoff at him."—Vol. i. p. 279.

It would not be amiss, we think, were this custom transferred from *New* to *Old* Ireland; and *Old* England, too, would be much benefited by such an enactment.

We are sorry not to be able to extract the account of the *Kurinaa*, or native dance, and the circumstances attending it; it is highly interesting, and excessively diverting. Speaking of their religion, Dr. Coulter says:—

"Kannua, their great god, was represented by huge images of about ten feet high, made of hard wood and polished. As usual with these figures in the Pacific, the arms were placed a-kimbo, resting on the haunches; the legs were also turned inwards, and what may be termed bandy, bringing the uncouth feet in close contact, and resting on a large block of wood. The head was large in proportion to the figure; two

large eyes, made by the insertion of polished oyster shells, in the centre of which was inserted a bit of wood stained black, to answer for the pupil; a large mouth, extending open from ear to ear, displaying a range of red pegs as a substitute for teeth. The curve of the mouth, with sundry furrows and carvings about it, gave an expression of laughter to the face, and drollery to the entire image, that no one could for a moment gaze on without smiling. The locality chosen for the erection of these idols was an eminence in the deep recesses of a dark wood, the cleft of a rock in a high mountain, or the entrance of some large cave; in all cases they were mysteriously concealed by surrounding trees and shrubs, and few of them could be seen until you entered the thicket and stood within ten yards or so of the figure. They are always placed either on a rock, or a mound of stones gathered for the purpose; look like sentinels on guard, and seemed well contented with their situation, as they were invariably laughing at the surrounding scene. Some of them had been evidently placed in their respective stations a long time, as green patches of moss had grown on them, and, not unfrequently, a wild vine or creeper had entwined itself around the limbs, body, and neck, throwing out a bush or shade from either shoulder; others were inclined to one side; some forward, making a bow to the visiters; while two that I saw had fallen down, and lay at the foot of the mound in the most comical position. . . . . Whenever an idol falls, and is broken or damaged, the natives consider him not worth another visit; and say, that as he cannot any longer keep himself up, his intercession with the great Kannua would be good for nothing. . . . . On going to war or returning from it, sickness or death in a family, they present offerings to their idols, consisting both of vegetables and animals, the decomposition of which renders the neighbourhood of the image highly offensive."—Vol. ii. p. 14.

After various adventures by sea and land they reached New Britain, where they became acquainted with a singular character of the name of Selwin, a Crusoe, as Dr. Coulter calls him, whose strange history forms one of the many minor attractions of these volumes.

In course of time they arrived at New Guinea, where the adventures of the captain and doctor are even more interesting than elsewhere. It was here that they fell in with Captain Stewart, celebrated as having, on one occasion, carried a shipload of dead bodies from one part of New Zealand to another, for a cannibal feast. Here, too, they had some amusing incidents with the Chinese traders. Here, on another occasion, they became acquainted with a young Englishman of the name of Miller, the representative of a Dutch firm, who had secured commerce for his friends, and happiness for himself, by wedding the very pleasing daughter of a native chief; and here, too, they made the friendship of that most interesting of all the *dramatis*

personæ of this work, Terry Connell, who, beginning life as a private soldier, and passing through the ordeal of Sydney, became at length the absolute monarch of a large and powerful tribe of the Horraforas :—

" The Horraforas . . . . . differ widely from the Papuan ; in fact, are a distinct race (having long *straight* hair, and greatly resembling the North American Indians). They are only similar in one particular, and that is, that both Papuan and Horraforas live in separate tribes, frequently speaking a different language, and, not unfrequently, one tribe of each will be at war with another of its own race. I have no proof that the Papuans are cannibals ; but I had ocular demonstration to tell me the Horraforas are,—men, women, and children. The latter have a horrible custom, I believe peculiar to themselves ; a young man, before he can possess his bride, must present her with a human head, which must not be mutilated, but, on careful examination of it by her family, bear the true marks and ornaments of one of an enemy. For this purpose, two or three young men who wish to have a wife, will start off in the direction of the enemy's tribe, and be out, perhaps, two months, skulking about, before they can surprise one of the enemy, and possess themselves of the desired head, which, when obtained, is carefully enveloped in damp leaves, then a deep covering of grass, and rolled over and over with twine or cord made of cocoa-nut fibre sinnet, so that it looks like a large ball. In the march home it is frequently dipped in water, to prevent decomposition as much as possible, until the presentation of it to the family of the intended bride. I happened to see two young men, who had been nearly three months away, return after an expedition of this kind. They certainly must have been greatly attached to their sweethearts, for their sufferings were great ; patches of their skin were torn off by the bushes, portions of it raised in large blisters, by being obliged to lie hours in the grass under a burning sun, lest they might be seen. Sundry bites of snakes about the legs ; in fact, they had suffered much, and traversed a distance of nearly three hundred miles, not on a railroad, or with shoes on, but on their naked feet, over a rough, ragged, barbarous country, all for love." —Vol. ii. p. 173.

Connell likewise informed them of the following more pleasing circumstances attending a Horrafora courtship :—

" After the young man had presented the skull of an enemy, procured, as I have before stated, at great personal risk, he became the accepted suitor ; but, as it were, the beauty of the affair consisted in the young man sending a leaf off one of the trees they build their houses in, with a small cord, made of his own long hair, attached to the stem of the leaf, to the young woman. She obtains one of a similar size, places them together, and makes both fast with a cord of hair, and sends it back to the young man. This very innocent transaction is,

on the girl's part, as much as to say, 'I have not changed my mind, the affair is settled.' On their appearance before the chief, this, as it were nuptial-tie and agreement, is held up to him, when he summarily ends the ceremony, as I have before stated, in Connell's words—viz. 'Och, as for that, it's short and sweet, it's by my ordhers only, and all I say is, when I get them all in twos (I never marries less than two couples at a time), away with yees all, be lovin, and live together.' " —p. 214.

From the continual dangers to which they are exposed, these people are in the habit of building their sleeping-rooms in the upper branches of large trees, where, by removing their ladders, they are in perfect safety.

" After close observation and much inquiry," says Dr. Coulter, " as to the religion of the Horraforas, the only conclusion that I could arrive at was, that they had none. They had a superstitious awe of lightning and thunder, and would not move on any war expedition, either day or night, as long as it lasted. The volcanoes that abound in the interior of this great island seemed also to attract their superstitious fears; and they formed some idea that an angry spirit, or departed great chief, was inside it pitching out the fire. A clouded sun often caused gloom over them, so much so, that they would scarcely move out of their nests in the trees until it shone out cloudless. Moonlight seemed to delight them all, and they hailed any unusual brightness as a good omen; but as to any direct Spirit, or image, to pay distinct adoration to, they had none."—Vol. ii. p. 254.

" What a rich country," says our author, " and extensive one, do these people possess! And how happy they might be, if they had only Christianity spread amongst them, and engraven on their hearts, that they might dwell in peace and brotherly love! On the other hand, I do not know how a Missionary could remain amongst them, as the imperative law of every tribe, both Papuan and Horrafora, is, that every man in the tribe must be a warrior, take his turn with the scouts, either fight, or be armed, and ready to do so. If this (I may say) rigid law is infringed upon by any man, he is instantly disgraced in his tribe, hunted clear of the line of scouts, where he is captured by another tribe, sold as a slave, or, if he resists, killed and eaten. This is a great bar against the residing amongst these savages of the mild and meek Minister of the Word of God. I rather think that an armed colony of Christians, in goodly numbers, must first plant themselves on the shores of New Guinea, and show and teach these ferocious barbarians the decided superiority of a Christian community over the heathen tribes, in every relation of life."—Vol. ii. p. 187.

" It is a pity," adds he afterwards, " that there is no European Christian settlement on so large an island. I should say the northern side, from its rocky shore and high land, would be the most healthy site for a colony."—p. 263.

The country is rich, possessing great mineral wealth, and abounding in bays, harbours, and large rivers.

In concluding this subject, we cannot avoid expressing our grief, not devoid of shame, that notwithstanding the wealth, the power, the enterprize, and the enlightenment of England, the islands of this vast ocean are still for the most part lying under the curse of heathenism, or left to the exertion of men who, whatever be their merits, are unable to consecrate the Holy Eucharist, or administer the ordinances of the Church; but, alas! in most places the name of "The Crucified" is altogether unknown, or heard of merely as the distinctive appellation of the murderer, the robber, and the destroyer. We should gladly hail some great national attempt to remove this disgrace from our Church and people. Why should not a *truly* Christian colony be founded in New Guinea by the alms of churchmen, carrying out at once a model community consisting of useful artisans, agricultural labourers, traders, farmers, and *gentlemen*, under the supremacy of a bishop, accompanied by a staff of Missionary clergy, sufficient to spread the glad tidings of peace and salvation by slow, but sure degrees, over the whole of the countless islands of the beautiful, but, alas! the heathen POLYNESIA?

ART. IV.—1. *Essays and Sermons. By the Rev.* HENRY WOODWARD, *A.M., formerly of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, Rector of Fethard, in the Diocese of Cashel.* 2 Vols. London: Duncan, 1845. *Fourth Edition.*

2. *The Shunammite. By the Same.* 2 Vols. London: Duncan.

3. *Some Passages of my Former Life. By the Same.* Dublin: M'Glashan, 1847.

4. *Short Readings; Essays; and Sermons. By the Same.* London: Hatchards, 1848.

THE policy of the Church of Rome is in no instance, perhaps, more apparent than in the scope which she provides for ardent minds, and in the liberty at which she leaves men to pursue their own mental course, provided the one point be secured, of loyal devotion to the interests of their Church. With us, if men differ from one another, their differences rend the Church. In the Roman Church men may differ widely on a variety of important particulars, and yet all that is great and powerful and influential in their thoughts and writings may subserve the one great end—the welfare and unity of that Church.

We plead guilty to some yearnings after power like this, rightly exercised, when we take into our hands one of Mr. Woodward's volumes. We long for the power which could leave free exercise to the talents, the originality, the deep spirituality of this distinguished man, and which could, at the same time, prevent his ever giving utterance to any thing at variance with Catholic truth.

In a brief publication, which we have placed No. 3 at the head of this article, Mr. Woodward has given us a touching insight into some of the circumstances of his life; and has, likewise, afforded us considerable assistance in forming our opinion of his works. He was, in a word, the subject of very sudden religious impressions. And if, to certain of our readers, there may appear somewhat of enthusiasm in this most interesting narrative, we must remember, that above forty years, as we believe, of a life spent in the most unworldly and self-denying piety—the prompt refusal, moreover, if report speak true, of various honours, such as most men ardently pursue—bear witness to the depth and permanence of Mr. Woodward's convictions. We must however, by the way, remark, that there is to us abundance of evidence scattered throughout the pages of these volumes, that Mr. Woodward's mind was early impressed with a deep sense of religious things; that the example and training of his honoured father, "Woodward, Bishop of Cloyne, at that time the most distin-

guished prelate on the Irish bench," were not lost upon him; and that, above all, to his baptism into Christ's holy Church, he was indebted in a manner which renders certain (few, we admit, and passing) references to that blessed Sacrament, on the part of Mr. Woodward, matter, to his most cordial admirers, of deep and sorrowful regret.

Mr. Woodward's early course, his subsequent friendship with his relative and patron Archbishop Brodrick, (ΥΨΗΛΟΤΑΤΟΣ ΜΕΝ ΒΙΩι· ΤΑΠΕΙΝΟΤΑΤΟΣ ΔΕ ΤΩι ΦΡΟΝΗΜΑΤΙ,) with Alexander Knox, and Bishop Jebb; these, combined with the mode in which certain impressions reached his mind, gave to his opinions a tone wholly at variance, in many important particulars, with the favourite doctrines of the so-called Evangelical party in the Church. This difference has remained unaltered. And while we freely admit, that certain statements of Mr. Woodward's may be claimed as favouring the position and sentiments of Low Churchmen, we are confident that all candid men will readily acknowledge, that on the one great point of the Articulus stantis vel cadentis ecclesiæ—on the subject of popular religion and of religious institutions—on the subject of Roman Catholic piety, and of the mode of dealing with members of the Church of Rome —that on these, and on various other topics, which, alas! divide our Church, Mr. Woodward's sentiments would gain but little favour at Exeter Hall, or on the platforms of the Evangelical world.

That there are statements, here and there throughout these pages, which we are at a loss to reconcile, and which we believe to be wholly inconsistent with the general tone and tenour of Mr. Woodward's works, we must candidly assert. We give, as an instance, some passages in the Essay No. VIII. in the volume which has just issued from the press. In that Essay Mr. Woodward's object is to deprecate a slavish adherence to antiquity, and specially a revival of certain obsolete usages. He begins with an amusing illustration, for which we have not space, and which we only notice for the purpose of reminding Mr. Woodward, that, singularly ingenious as his illustrations generally are, illustration is not, necessarily, argument; nay, that the effect of an illustration is, often, to deceive the mind, and, through very speciousness, to involve it in inextricable error. After referring to this taste for the revival of obsolete customs, our author proceeds:

"But what I lament is, that a spirit should have been evoked, whose great anxiety is to set the lees and dregs afloat, to shake the vessel, and bring the sediment to the surface. Here, I am convinced, the *summum jus* is the *summa injuria*, and that straining at gnats may give us camels to swallow. Allow the stickler for rigid form to be right, one by one, in each trifling matter of detail, he is wrong in the proportion

of zeal and labour which he expends upon them. He may be right in paying his tithe of mint, and anise, and cummin; but if his heart be narrowed up in these, it cannot expand itself to the breadth of the 'weightier matters of the law,—judgment, mercy, and faith.'—p. 282.

So far all must be agreed. These general views none can possibly disapprove. But we are anxious for an instance to which these general principles are applicable. We confess, then, that the mode in which the Essay proceeds to its termination, is not, in our judgment, worthy of Mr. Woodward's candour, sagacity, or erudition. The whole of the rest of the Essay is devoted to a discussion of certain points connected with Infant Baptism. Our author does not say in so many words,—he dare not, even were he so inclined, which, there is evidence to prove, he is not,—that Holy Baptism, or the doctrine of our Regeneration in that blessed Sacrament, presents an instance of "overweening value set on forms and circumstantials and positive institutions."—p. 285. No: but Mr. Woodward introduces the subject of Holy Baptism so as to give it all the appearance of being one of these revived antiquities, in a manner which the opponents of the great divines of our own Church will hail with considerable satisfaction. Immediately after the passage which we have quoted above, the Essay thus proceeds:—

"And, in this connexion, I cannot but make the following observation:—Presumptuous as is the manner in which some depreciate baptism, and inconsistent as it seems in a churchman to deny that infants may receive the regenerating Grace of God in that appointed Sacrament; yet, unless this latter doctrine be held with a full admission that the adult transgressor, living without God, requires as entire and radical a change as if he had not been baptized at all; in that case, such a notion seems to me to extract the very marrow, and to evacuate the very essence of the Gospel revelation."—pp. 282, 283.

We are not to be drawn aside into a discussion of the fundamental doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration. We regret that Mr. Woodward should adopt the plan, common with superficial controversialists, of himself stating the arguments which he would combat. If he will enter the lists of controversy, let him quote chapter and verse of his opponent, and then we shall be able to pronounce upon the weakness or strength of his attacks. But we mean it as no bad compliment to our author, when we assert that, in our judgment, controversy is not his fort; it is evidently not his congenial element. He seldom engages in it, and we rejoice that it is so: when he does, his good genius forsakes him. He is suited to other and higher things. And as a specimen of his powers we would point to Essay No. I. in his last volume. We do not remember on that vexata quæstio, "the cessation of

miracles in the Church," to have seen, within the same space, so much ingenuity, combined with such sober and solid argument.

But the most striking point in Mr. Woodward's writings, the point which most excites our admiration, and, we trust, improves our hearts, is the high and elevated standard of holiness which he ever places before us—the deeply-practical tendency of all his thoughts, even of those which, to unimaginative minds, may seem to savour of paradox and speculation. In the midst of all, the one thing needful is never, for one moment, lost sight of. No writer more continually directs our views upwards: nor are we acquainted with any, who aids us more, by his counsel and experience, in the arduous ascent which leads to "glory and honour and immortality."

We wish we had room for many extracts; we must content ourselves with one.

"Nor is this the only instance in which our own inward misgivings, our vain imaginings, and groundless fears, may be made to work together for our own good. I believe that in the case of those who lead a more interior life, God in his mercy often causes the fear of evils to administer the corrective chastening, that the evils themselves are employed in other instances to carry out. Thus, if the loss of friends be in its nature calculated to wean us from the world, I believe that the timid and anxious mind, the spirit which is 'over-exquisite to shape the fashion of uncertain ill,' the too-fond heart which in every trifling ailment, in every change of look, in every transient flutter of the pulse, in every wind that visits the face of one much-loved too roughly, sees the first symptom or distant approaches of that which may increase and gather strength to lay that idol in the dust—the man so constituted, I say, will often derive from those fears all the discipline, and all the weaning from earth, and all the persuasives to cast himself upon God, that he could derive from the actual realization of those fears. It is thus with the person who is morbidly and painfully watchful of his own health, and harassed by the thoughts of imaginary diseases. It is thus with the man who is careful about many things, and who sees 'poverty as an armed man' ready to invade his dwelling. These, and many like, are the vain shadows in which men walk severally, as the complexion of their minds may be; and these often serve the purposes of those substances whose shapes they take. They are overruled by a merciful Providence, so that the threatening interposes and wards off the blow itself; the apprehension averts the evil of which it gave a false alarm. I remember, in former days, one saying to me, when depressed, as I often was, with vain imaginations, 'Depend upon it, what is thus feared will never come.' I do not recollect how that person reasoned upon the subject, or whether this opinion was formed merely from an extensive knowledge of mankind; but it seems to me that this saying, so replete with encouragement to the morbidly appre-

hensive, is fully borne out by the principle here set forth, namely, that the fear of any evil, if that fear be impressed with a certain intensity upon the mind, and if that mind be under the good guidance of God, will turn off the evil it contemplates. For God does not grieve willingly, nor lay on one stripe more than the case requires. And if the apprehension which goes before the stroke be so lively, nay, so exaggerated an image of the thing it dreads, that it produces all the effects, or more than the effects, of the calamity itself, He who does nothing in vain, will not afflict merely for afflicting sake.

"Let us then turn this consideration to practical account. If thoughts of trials and sorrows to come invade the heart, let us ask ourselves what purposes those afflictions are calculated to serve, what lessons they are designed to teach. Let us meet those intentions, let us learn those lessons. Let us endeavour to avoid, to practise, and to be, whatever this warning voice would tell us to avoid, to practise, and to be. Let us endeavour to assume the shape into which the plastic hand of a chastening God would mould us. Let us turn our vain imaginings to good account. And let us comfort ourselves with the assurance that God will load us with no useless burdens; and that, if by His grace assisting us, we purify our hearts from sin, He will be more anxious than we ourselves that we may be saved from the refining process of the furnace of affliction."—pp. 377—379.

We now take our leave of Mr. Woodward, with unfeigned respect for his character, his virtues, and his talents. We trust that his voice may reach many at this side of the channel, and urge them onwards in the race of holiness. We hail his voice with the greater admiration, and the more respectful welcome, when we remember that it issues from the far-famed county of Tipperary, that land of turmoil and of blood. From that same county, if we mistake not, it was our happiness to welcome, a few years ago, the voice of one of Mr. Woodward's earliest friends, the late-lamented and venerated Bishop Jebb. Such facts are full of encouragement. They remind us vividly of principles, which no discouragements can silence; of a communion of saints, which "the craft and subtilty of the devil, or man," cannot interrupt. And if amidst our admiration of Mr. Woodward's writings, and our substantial agreement with the greater portion of what flows from his pen, certain points arise with which we cannot possibly concur, we trust that, in respect of these, we may, without presumption, borrow the language of the distinguished prelate, to whom we have just referred—"I doubt not that one moment of the light of eternity will clear up every difficulty; and we shall find ourselves to be *ἑνὶ πνεύματι μιᾷ ψυχῇ*, (Phil. i. 27,) or, as it is yet more pithily expressed in the same epistle, (ii. 2,) *σύμψυχοι, τὸ ἓν φρονοῦντες*."—*Forster's Life of Bishop Jebb*, vol. ii. pp. 464-5.

ART. V.—1. *The Bull* "IN CŒNÂ DOMINI" *translated into English, with a short Historical Introduction; and evidence of its present validity, as part of the Roman law, and of its recognition by the Romish Hierarchy in Ireland. Published for the* NATIONAL CLUB. London: Hatchard, 1848.

2. *A Letter to the* EARL OF ARUNDEL AND SURREY *on the Bull* "IN CŒNÂ DOMINI," *by the* EDITOR OF THE BULL, *as published for the* NATIONAL CLUB. London: Hatchard, 1848.

3. *Papal Diplomacy and the Bull* "IN CŒNÂ DOMINI;" *or a Collection of authentic Facts and Documents, proving that the principles of the Bull* "IN CŒNÂ DOMINI" *are the only principles of international law recognized by the Papacy. By the* EDITOR OF THE BULL, *as published for the* NATIONAL CLUB. London: Hatchard, 1848.

THESE three publications, which have been put forth in rapid succession during the first two months of the present year, have for their object to supply the public with authentic information on the character of the papacy. The measures which have been brought under the consideration of the legislature this session,—Mr. Anstey's "Roman Catholic Relief" Bill, on the one hand, the ministerial "Diplomatic Relations" Bill, on the other hand,—being calculated, in the most direct manner, to deliver this country over into the hands of the papacy, the National Club has done good service to the people of England, by giving them the means of judging for themselves of the character of the power which claims unlimited licence to run riot in the land, and official recognition, denied to it for the last three centuries, by the British Crown. Want of space compels us to confine our remarks to a brief sketch of the contents of these eminently seasonable publications, which their extremely low price places within the reach of all; while the manner in which the subject is treated, makes the intricacies of Romish law and diplomacy intelligible to the ordinary reader. We should add, however, that, as the titles of No. 1 and No. 3 indicate, they are of a strictly documentary character; and No. 2, though polemical in form, is in substance nothing more than an appendix to No. 1, rendered necessary by the exceedingly weak attempt of the Earl of Arundel and Surrey to invalidate the facts demonstrated in No. 1. There is not, in

any of the three pamphlets any of that mere declamation—*vox et præterea nihil*—which is so often employed by the champions of the Protestant cause, and which has done that cause more harm than good. We have here to do with facts and documents; the whole is a sober and searching inquiry into the laws and the diplomacy of Rome.

No. 1, called forth by Mr. Anstey's Bill, confines itself to the examination of the papal system, as it bears upon the internal relations of a country whose faith and constitution is opposed to popery, and in which the popish hierarchy has obtained an extensive footing. In the historical introduction with which it opens, it is shown that the true principles of the papacy, as a system of pretended ecclesiastical supremacy over all Christendom, are to be found in the Bull "*In Cœnâ Domini*," the Magna Charta and Bill of Rights, so to speak, of the papacy. Having traced the bull through its different forms and stages from the time of Boniface VIII., the editor sums up the result of his investigation by saying: (p. 8) "Thus it appears, that the Bull *Cœnæ* is, in fact, a collection of all that was deemed most important for the advancement and maintenance of the power of the papacy; as its pretensions increased, so the Bull *Cœnæ*, or form of excommunication, annually republished, of all that ventured to oppose the extravagant claims of the Roman See, grew more and more bulky, till at last it assumed the form in which it has now continued for two centuries and a half; being, to use the expression of a Roman Canonist, 'the chiefest and firmest pillar' of papal usurpation."

The history of the Bull is followed by a translation of the latest edition of it, which was published by Clement XIII., in the year 1759; and which is substantially, and almost *verbatim*, the same as that published by Clement VIII., in the year 1593. For the extraordinary collection of anathemas which it contains, and which are hurled not only at those who differ from the Romish Church in matters of faith, but against every act of jurisdiction in Church matters which is exercised by any temporal power, Roman Catholic or Protestant, and against every resistance, legislative, judicial, or otherwise, to the extravagant claims of the Roman See; as well as for the no less extraordinary provisions by which the perpetual and universal validity of the Bull is, as far as it is in the power of the papacy to do so, secured, and the papacy itself precluded from ever revoking or annulling it,—we must refer our readers to the document itself.

Next after the translation of the Bull, No. 1 contains irrefragable proofs, taken from unquestionable and acknowledged authorities on the Roman Canon law, of the present validity of

the Bull; and, in a second section, equally conclusive evidence, again drawn from the acknowledged standards of the Romish Church, that the Bull is recognized by the Roman Catholic hierarchy in Ireland, and that its principles are incorporated "with their system of doctrine and of diocesan government." The objection that Roman Catholic prelates have, before parliamentary committees, upon their oaths denied the validity of the Bull in Ireland, is met on the one hand by the undeniable fact, that their own Guide-Book to Confessors contains its provisions, even those directed against Protestant "princes and governors," in so many words, and in the form of quotations from the Bull; and, on the other hand, by reference to the reservations as to the obligation of oaths, contained in the Roman Catholic class-books of casuistry; whence the legitimate inference is, that "however inconsistent the statements upon oath of the Roman Catholic bishops may be with the facts of the case, the making those statements,—and that in their own view of the matter conscientiously,—is not inconsistent with the principles of their Church."

The practical conclusion, resulting from the evidence placed before the public, is suggested at the close of the pamphlet in the form of questions; in answer to which, we have no hesitation in stating our conviction, that it is impossible "for any covenant to subsist between a Church holding the principles of the Bull '*In Cœnâ Domini*' as fundamental principles of her constitution, and a state accounted heretical by that Church, and excommunicated, with all its constituted authorities, spiritual and temporal, by that Bull;" that "loyalty to such a state is incompatible with allegiance to such a Church;" and that "the prevalence of outrage and sedition in Ireland is justly attributable to the inculcation of the principles of the Bull '*In Cœnâ Domini*' into the minds of the priests, and, through them, of the population at large."

No. 2 is, as we have already intimated, a vindication of No. 1 against certain sophistries put forth by the Romanists, under shelter of Lord Arundel's name and fair fame. The editor of the Bull, in answering his lordship, has taken care to distinguish between the noble earl himself and his arguments,—between the Roman Catholic laity and the hierarchy of the Romish Church,—between the inconsistency of the former and the bad faith of the latter. The refutation is complete; and not only disposes satisfactorily of all the points raised against the evidence in No. 1, but demolishes some new fallacies, intended to disprove the present validity of the Bull, which were imported into the argument by Lord Arundel's pamphlet.

No. 3 is, as the last, so the most important of the three publications. It was called forth by that legislative abortion, the ministerial bill for legalizing diplomatic intercourse between the British crown and the "Sovereign Pontiff." The nature of its contents will be best explained by the following outline of the argument:

"1. To show,—not now from the principles and provisions of Roman Canon law, but from historical facts and international transactions,—that in spite of all the opposition which it had to encounter, the papacy has continued to uphold the Bull "*In Cœnâ Domini*" as the great charter of what is called the liberty and immunity of the Church, but what in reality is the usurpation and tyranny of Rome.

"2. To show, by reference to the legislative enactments of different countries,—even of those countries which have been foremost in their support of the Romish faith,—that all the states which ever acknowledged the pope, or had dealings with him, found themselves compelled, in self-defence, to adopt stringent measures against the intrusions and encroachments of the papacy.

"3. To show, by reference to diplomatic documents, that Rome is, internationally considered, in a position unparalleled in the history of the world,—refusing to acknowledge the principles of international law by which the conduct of all other powers is regulated, and propounding principles of international law of its own, which are no other than the principles of the Bull "*In Cœnâ Domini*," and which no state, Roman Catholic or Protestant, can recognize, without at once sacrificing its own sovereignty and independence."

Under the first head we have a complete history of the resistance which the Bull encountered every where from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries down to the present day, and of the insidious means taken again and again by the Romish hierarchy for introducing it, and diffusing its principles; and, among other striking facts, proof of the express recognition of the continued validity of the Bull in 1800 by Pius VII. Under the second head the editor of the Bull has collected a great mass of information touching the legislative provisions adopted against papal encroachments generally in the different states of Europe, exhibiting the remarkable fact, that the most stringent regulations against the papacy have been adopted in those countries which are most thoroughly popish. The information is arranged under three heads: 1. The royal *Placet* necessary for the publication of papal rescripts; 2. the limitation imposed upon papal ambassadors in different states, and upon the intercourse of their Roman Catholic subjects with the pope; 3. the oath of allegiance required of Roman Catholic subjects, and the reservations introduced into the oath of allegiance to the pope, taken by the Roman Catholic hierarchy.

But the most extraordinary part of the information thrown together in this pamphlet, and that which will surprise our readers as much as it has surprised ourselves, is the fact, proved by documentary evidence in the third section, that the papacy is by solemn protests, renewed from time to time, from the peace of Westphalia to the Congress of Vienna, exempt from the obligation of acknowledging a single jot or title of all the international settlements in Europe, for the last two hundred years; and that the papacy has reserved to itself by another series of solemn protests, the last of which was placed on record by Gregory XVI. in 1831, the right of disallowing the title of any of the sovereigns and powers of Europe with which it may have had, no matter for how long a time, diplomatical dealings. This section further contains valuable documentary information as to the tendency manifested by the papacy since the pacification of Europe, and the mischiefs which it has already done by its interference, every where, with national politics. A volume of official documents just presented to parliament, touching the late struggle in Switzerland, has supplied the editor with interesting materials on this part of his case.

The argument is wound up by evidence equally strong, of the *animus* of the papacy towards England, and of the results which the papists themselves anticipate from the legislative changes adopted or proposed, with a view to increase the power and influence of the papacy in this country.

We can recommend this pamphlet with confidence to those of our readers who are desirous of obtaining an insight into the whole question of church and state on the Continent. The care and caution which foreign diplomacy has found it essential to employ in its dealings with Rome, is indeed most distinctly shown in the pages before us; and most singular is the contrast which our homespun diplomacy in England, in reference to the same subject, presents.

The objects of our poor statesmen here are, indeed, plain enough. They imagine that every one does not see through their transparent pretences of "the expediency of holding diplomatic intercourse with a state situated in the centre of Europe, where many English reside, and where *information* may be obtained, &c.!" As if it were possible for a moment to avoid seeing that the real object is to obtain influence over the Irish Romanists, and bend them to the will of government by the influence of the pope! Ireland is the great difficulty of English statesmen, because they do not know how to govern it. They cannot conceive the idea of any thing else but the "English constitution" in that country; and therefore they are at their wit's end, and would most thankfully pay the Romish priests, establish the papacy in the plenitude of its

power,—ay, we believe, pay *Peter's pence*, and go on a pilgrimage to Rome and kiss the Pope's toe, if they could find a way to keep Ireland in order. It is the calamity of this country, that all her statesmen are, as politicians, without any settled principles either religious or political; and the consequence is an uninterrupted series of measures in favour of every active and clamorous sect of religionists in the country, and a more and more distinct avowal, on the part of the state, of its indifference to all forms of religion.

Amidst such utter prostration of political and religious principle, Romanism might seem to have a fair prospect of obtaining in time all the objects of its ambition. The papacy itself might seem to have before it the certainty of holding one country at least in which the anathemas of the Bull *Cœnæ* might be published with impunity, and in which its powers of all kinds might disclose themselves into full maturity; but in the mean time the poor craft of our statesmen, and the rejoicings of Rome may be set at nought by that power which Rome itself has been so busy in raising up. We shall see whether the church of Rome will be able, according to Father Ventura's suggestion, not merely "to turn towards the Democracy," but to "*baptize* that wild matron, and *Christianize* her!" We shall see whether Pius IX. will be able to concede all that democracy demands; for if he does not—FAREWELL TO THE PAPACY!

Art. VI.—1. *Brownson's Quarterly Review, New Series, No. I. January*, 1847; *No. IV. October*, 1847. Boston (U.S.): Benjamin Greene.

2. *The Dublin Review, No. XLIV. July*, 1847; *No. XLVI. January*, 1848. London: Richardsons.

That the English Church has for upwards of a century been deprived of her ordinary and legal powers of deciding controversies of doctrine and discipline, by the arbitrary interference of the royal prerogative, is one of those facts which have not been borne in mind by those who have objected to the Church the controversies, parties, and dissensions which have so lamentably prevailed amongst us within the last half century. Or if this fact has been remembered at all, it has been rather with a feeling of indignation at the suffering Church, than at the government which has injured her. The "slavery of the Church to the State" has been the ground on which odium has been excited against her. It has been the chosen theme of dissenters and of Romanists, who are always, however, the first to *resist* any attempt on the part of churchmen to put an end to such a state of things. Of course, where no recognized tribunal exists for the settlement of rising controversies, they become permanent, and give birth to parties in the Church; and it is from this cause, we believe, more than any other, that many individuals have been led astray by the specious theories of Romanism, and its high professions of an infallible certainty in all matters of faith—a living authority ever at hand to pronounce on all matters of controversy—and a unity which precludes the possibility of the slightest difference in faith amidst her adherents.

To enter the communion of the Church of Rome is, according to the promises of its admirers, to exchange the most painful uncertainty on all religious questions for a heavenly calm and peace in which all doubt and questioning is at an end, while the blissful soul floats in a sort of Elysium, listening to the voice of the oracle which ever and anon delivers its inspired responses. Well! we who remain here below, hearkening to all that is told us of the Paradise to which we are invited, might be at times almost

persuaded out of our senses by the assurances delivered with so much eagerness on all sides—did we not recollect certain "awkward facts"—which repress our tendencies to poetry and romance in religion; and leave us, notwithstanding all that we hear, in that belief which we have inherited from our pious forefathers.

It would be of course a very desirable and convenient thing to possess a tribunal which could *infallibly* decide on matters of controversy, and to have St. Peter himself with his full apostolic authority and inspiration presiding in the Church. This is all very good indeed; but then the only question is, Suppose that the whole doctrine is a *mistake*, what benefit do we derive from the theory? And then comes that very awkward question—an old one which has been answered, but never answered satisfactorily —How comes it that the Church of Rome cannot agree where this infallible tribunal is to be found? We are not going to enter on this question, or to remark on the answers which have been given; because our business is not at this moment with any of the controversies of former times, but with one which has arisen in our own day, and which is in our view the most momentous in its bearing on the questions between Romanism and its opponents that has ever yet been seen.

Our readers are, we presume, tolerably familiar with the theory of development, which, some years previous to Mr. Newman's departure from the Church, had been fabricated or adopted by that ingenious and subtle thinker, and had become the distinctive mark of all his partizans. For three or four years before this party forsook the communion of the Church, we had been met, in every direction, by this doctrine of development, which was sometimes mentioned in a sort of mysterious way in conversation, and sometimes was a kind of under-current in the mind, which could only faintly be discerned. Yet the theory had not fairly appeared before the public. We sought in vain for it. We were referred indeed to De Maistre and Möhler; but their expressions were little more than *obiter dicta*, and lacked all that kind of definitiveness and detail which might have sufficed to account for the general spread of the notion amongst men of no particular ability or originality of mind. The mystery, however, was solved by the appearance of Mr. Newman's work on development; a work which gave evidence of long thought upon the subject. It was plain that the notion must have been *for years* working in the author's mind; and the elaborate Essay which for the first time brought it before the public in a systematic form, bears evidence of protracted researches and vast literary labour. It was here at a glance that one could see the teaching which had *for years*, in

private, influenced the opinions of the school which the highly-gifted author had gathered under his protection, and which had followed him with a prostration of faith scarcely less than if its object had been actually inspired.

The "Essay on Development" was the author's explanation of his grounds for seeking the communion of the Church of Rome, and forsaking that of England. It was learned, ingenious, brilliant, and, in the opinion of Mr. Newman's followers, demonstrative. The accession of so distinguished a leader to the Romish communion was hailed with rapturous delight; which was for a time kept up to "fever heat" by the train of young gentlemen, and ladies, who for a time followed the example of their master. In the excitement of the moment, it was conceived by Romanists all over Europe that the whole Church of England was on the point of turning Roman Catholic; and woeful, we believe, has been the disappointment which has ensued, and sore the irritation of many, both converts and others, on surveying the actual numerical force of the recent converts to Romanism. We will not do more than allude passingly to this however. On the appearance of the "Essay on Development," all was rejoicing in the Romish communion. The author had been already announced by leading Romanists as the ablest living theologian, not merely amongst "Anglicans," but in all Europe. When his work made its appearance, an article in the "Dublin Review," attributed to Dr. Wiseman, described it as "the process of reasoning by which the author's powerful and well-stored mind was brought to a full accordance with catholic truth," and declared that "*the catholic system* is embraced" in it "with the fervour and *simplicity* of one trained from infancy to the faith." Dr. Gillis, Vicar Apostolic at Edinburgh, delivered a course of public *Lectures* on the work; explaining it, as we learnt from a letter in the "Tablet," "to the comprehension of the humblest and least instructed, as well as to the admiration and charm of his more favoured auditors." On the author's progress through the continent to Rome, he was every where received with marks of the most profound respect. At Paris we learn from the "Univers" that he was received with "marks of tender cordiality by Monsignor the Apostolic Nuncio, and Monsignor the Archbishop of Paris." This "celebrated child of the Church" excited equal interest at Langres, where "forty or fifty members of the clergy had the honour of being presented to him;" and where he was received by the bishop "with the ardour and cordiality of a brother:" in fine, this "*Avant Coureur*, dispatched by England in order to announce to Rome her return to the faith of her forefathers," was received at Rome with the utmost *empressement* by Pius IX. The

meeting of these two eminent personages by accident in St. Peter's, was described as an event of historical importance. We afterwards heard of the favours bestowed on the author of the "Essay on Development"—the crucifix which the "holy father" presented to him—the visit "incognito" which he received from the Pope—the mission which was entrusted to his honoured hands of conveying the Bulls erecting new Romish sees in England. To talk of the writings of so eminent a person being put in the "Index Expurgatorius," would, of course, be an absurdity. His Essay has been universally praised and admired; and two translations of the work into French, testify the interest which it has excited, and the extent to which its principles are spreading.

The "Dublin Review," which is the leading organ of the Romanists of the United Kingdom, not only applauded the "Essay on Development" in its publication, but has steadily continued to advocate the views and principles of that ingenious work.

It is, in truth, a very curious and striking fact,—and one which, perhaps, can scarcely be paralleled in the history of the Romish Church, that a convert from what she deems an heretical community, should, in the bosom of that community, have devised a theory, which, after being rejected by the Church in which it was first propounded, should be received, with open arms, by the Roman Church herself. Mr. Newman has carried his theory of development, and his *school* of development along with him; and the doctrines of this new *school* have gained undisputed possession of the leading Romish periodical of the day. A large proportion of the articles in that periodical are written by recent converts—disciples of Mr. Newman; and their fundamental doctrines, embracing the whole of his theory, are familiarly recognized in every number. In point of fact, the theory of development bids fair, under the auspices of Mr. Newman and his friends, openly supported as they are by Dr. Wiseman and the "Dublin Review," to gain a permanent ascendancy in the Romish communion.

We can certainly hardly imagine a position more gratifying to the learned author of this theory, than to feel himself thus wonderfully constituted the guide and instructor of the Roman Catholic world. The tribute offered to the merit of his discoveries, by their adoption by a Church, invested, as he believes, with infallibility, must more than repay his friends for any slight which they may have experienced elsewhere; and we should imagine that, in such an unprecedented chain of circumstances, they may find new grounds for the veneration with which they have long followed the steps of their master. It is truly remarkable, that a recent convert from "Anglicanism" should be enabled to establish a great system of theological argument on behalf of Romanism,

which has been unknown to all her chief theologians. Not to speak of such familiar names of Romish divines as Wiseman, Milner, Doyle, Husenbeth, Lingard, Kenrick, Berington, and Kirk; or again, of such writers as Trévern, Bouvier, La Mennais, De la Luzerne, Fraysinnoüs, Perrone—the whole body of eminent theologians of former times, such as Bossuet, Bellarmine, Valentia, Cano, and more than we can find space to name, are, after all, mere sciolists in comparison with the school which, in the nineteenth century, has undertaken to devise a new system of defence for Romanism; and which, in so doing, has broken down all the systems on which it has hitherto been maintained.

Development, like free trade, is a sweeping theory; it sweeps away every thing: the whole old system of Romish controversy is gone when the new theory is admitted.

In the nineteenth century changes are so rife that scarcely any thing ought to surprise us. We have lived to see a *sans culotte* pope; and we suppose that, after all, we have been perhaps mistaken in imagining that the Church of Rome is disinclined to change her doctrine, and to adopt novelties. Perhaps, after all, we have been deceiving ourselves in believing the hitherto uninterrupted declarations of all Romanists, whether learned or unlearned, that their doctrine is unalterable and invariable. The cordial and unsuspecting reception which the theory of development, propounded by Mr. Newman and his disciples, has met in Romish Europe, gives, we confess, a significance which we had never before attached to the declarations of politicians, that Rome is no longer what she was; and that popery is fast approximating to protestantism and "liberality of views."

We protest that we are almost inclined to believe this when we look at the applause with which the "Essay on Development" has been received, and the actual position it has gained in the Romish communion, as a recognized and avowed doctrine; and then see *what* this doctrine is—in its foundation and its superstructure.

The theory of development is, in its foundation, a most striking act of *homage to truth*. It is a bold and frank confession, that the simple facts of history or tradition are at variance with Romanism; that the doctrine and discipline of the early Church were different from those of Romanism: it is a theory to explain the variations between primitive Christianity and popery. And this comes from no hostile source: it is the painful conviction of minds which have laboured for years in studies which Romanists themselves have regarded with admiration, and which *ought* certainly to render them no very incompetent judges on such matters,—of minds which are profoundly attached to Romanism, in its very

utmost excess of superstition. The very men, whose reason tells them that there are great and important differences between Romanism and primitive Christianity, are so earnest in their adoption of the worship of that Church, that they exceed in their language of adoration of the Saints or the Virgin Mary the most earnest Romanists, and can even blame them for the lukewarmness of their devotions.

Such concessions, then, as we have referred to, have obviously been wrung out by the mere force of truth; and it is undoubtedly gratifying to find, that so broad and so important an admission has not, in any degree, excited the jealousy of the great body of those to whom the guardianship of the Roman Catholic faith is entrusted. To Dr. Wiseman, and his brother vicars apostolic, (who *lecture* on the Essay,) this principle must doubtless seem innocuous, as no objection has ever been made to it by them; and we have therefore to congratulate them, and the English Romanists generally, on the concessions which they seem inclined to make to us. We have always contended that there was a great and most essential difference between Romanism and primitive Christianity; and in this, it seems, it is now tacitly admitted, that we have been *in the right*, and those Romanists who have hitherto opposed us have been *in the wrong*.

In the nineteenth century, when progress and change is the order of the day, we ought not, perhaps, to be surprised at the encouragement which has been extended by Romanism to principles of so novel and momentous a character; yet we confess, that as we have pondered over the matter, we have been unable wholly to repress some such feelings, more especially when we come to contemplate the bold and striking concessions on matters of detail, which the advocates of this theory are in the habit of making to the opponents of the Church of Rome. According to them, the primitive Church had no fixed belief on the subject of the Trinity, or the Incarnation. The doctrines of Purgatory, Penance, Transubstantiation, worship of the Saints and the Virgin Mary, worship of images and relics, and, above all, the papal supremacy, were all invented long after the apostolic age, and were not taught either by Scripture or tradition. These writers even take pains to prove that it was quite impossible, in the nature of things, that many of these doctrines could have existed in the apostolic age. The fathers of the Church are represented as men imperfectly informed on many of the articles of Catholic faith, and full of contradictions and of heresies. Now this is at once seen to be a view widely different from all the teaching of Romanists hitherto; at least, all that comes

ordinarily in our way. All the treatises on theology used in the Romish seminaries—all the books of controversy put forth for the last century, from the goodly folio down to the penny tract, are written on a contradictory system. In them we find the most uniform and the most confident assertions, that every doctrine of the Roman Catholic faith has been either taught in Scripture, or handed down by tradition; and the fathers and councils are regularly quoted in proof of every doctrine and institution which is a matter of controversy.

In viewing the strong and glaring contradiction which is thus exhibited, we regard it as only natural, that after a certain time had been devoted by the Church of Rome to the intoxication of triumph, which the conversion of Mr. Newman and his band of disciples excited, more serious thoughts should arise in some quarters, and inquiries should be instituted as to the value of the acquisition which had been made.

It could hardly, perhaps, be expected, that such inquiries should commence in this country, committed as the English Romanists have been to the unflinching support of Mr. Newman and his party, by the unqualified and anxious approbation given to them by Dr. Wiseman and the "Dublin Review." The credit of this able ecclesiastic is altogether bound up with the character of the recent converts; and we may feel tolerably certain, therefore, that in England, at least, no Romanist will be permitted to give expression to opinions adverse to the doctrine of development. In England, and probably Ireland, at least, this doctrine has a fair prospect of being recognized as the *only* true mode of defending Romanism. The advocates of that doctrine, amongst English Romanists, boldly take this position, and deny the validity of the ordinary course of argument; and they are, in one respect, quite right; for it is absolutely impossible to maintain *both* lines of argument.

But in other parts of the Romish communion the same obstacles to the freedom of thought and expression do not exist; and, accordingly, we find that in America, where the old system of argument has hitherto prevailed, an opposition has at length arisen to the principles of the "Essay on Development." "Brownson's Quarterly Review," the leading organ of the Romish communion in America, has, under the direction of their ecclesiastical authorities in that country, published a series of charges against the doctrines of Mr. Newman's Essay, and of the "Dublin Review," as calculated wholly to subvert Christianity, and as contrary to the Catholic faith in numberless points. Their adherents are regarded as in error or heresy, and the school collectively

receives the uncoveted title of "*Developmentists.*" In fine, the judgment of the Church is called for, and the condemnation of Mr. Newman's book by authority is evidently expected. There seems a kind of fatality about these men. Wherever they may be, they are so unfortunate as to earn for themselves the title of a sect. They are now "Developmentists," just as they were formerly "Tractarians."

To us, of course, the views which may be entertained by this school are now of comparatively little importance. Their theories have been, we may say, unanimously rejected by the Church of England; and nothing that comes from them can have the slightest weight with Churchmen. Their secession has relieved us from the unceasing irritation and uneasiness to which their wild speculations and their unbounded spiritual pride gave rise. But the leaven has now begun to work in Romanism. In the overwhelming anxiety of Dr. Wiseman and his party to obtain the conversion of England, which they had so long announced as at hand, Romanism forgot its caution, neglected any inquiries into the opinions of those whom it was receiving, and gave them access to the means of influencing public opinion within their new communion.

It is not for us to express any opinion at the course which should be pursued by the Church of Rome in this matter. But this we do clearly see, that if matters progress as they have begun, consequences will ere long result, which will not be very satisfactory to Romanists, or beneficial to the *general* interests of their communion. We ourselves are disposed to anticipate the speedy and quiet *suppression* of the controversy which has now arisen. It is one of so dangerous a character, that we feel persuaded that it will not be permitted to continue. The "Dublin Review," and "Brownson's Quarterly," will, we presume, receive their orders to leave such questions alone for the future; and "the faithful" will be at liberty to adopt which ever of the rival theories they prefer, and to acknowledge those who hold the contrary view as "good Catholics." Such would be the ordinary course of things in the Romish Church; but if this course be adopted, it will not, we feel sure, be taken without a clear perception of the *dangers* and difficulties which attend it. The first and greatest of these is the risk which must be run, if Romanism is maintained on principles which are *directly contradictory to each other.* This would not be unobserved by opponents; and it would render the position of Romanism simply ridiculous. How to avoid this difficulty, without expressing any disapprobation of one or other of the rival theories, is, we think, a problem, which will not easily be solved by the ingenuity even of the "*Propaganda.*"

We have perhaps detained our readers too long from the de-

tails of the controversy which has arisen within the Roman communion on those very important subjects.

In January, 1847, an article made its appearance in "Brownson's Quarterly Review," in which the controversy was formally commenced. In a former number of his publication, the editor had already pointed out certain dangerous results of Mr. Newman's doctrines; but no reply had been vouchsafed. He therefore availed himself of another opportunity of bringing the subject before the public.

The reviewer took as his text a recent publication by Mr. J. Spencer Northcote, (one of Mr. Newman's disciples,) entitled "The Fourfold Difficulty of Anglicanism;" and after bestowing commendation on the work, (which is a mere repetition of the common-place argument of Romanists,) and noticing one or two concessions dangerous to the cause of Romanism which the author had made, he fixes his attention on the following passage:—

"All Catholic doctrine, as held by the Roman Church, has been the result of one continual law of growth, and has therefore the unity of nature and life. . . . The Gospel, it is true, is a Divine message, yet as the language in which it is made is human, questions may naturally suggest themselves, almost without end, as to the real import of that language . . . and inquiries of this kind have, as you know, from time to time arisen in the Church, more or less supported by scriptural and traditional evidence. These have gradually gained ground and attracted notice, until the Church has felt herself obliged to pronounce judgment upon them, and thenceforward, according to her seal of sanction or anathema, such *opinions* have either been incorporated into the *Catholic Creed*, or denounced as contrary to it."

The reviewer is of opinion that this necessarily implies that Christian doctrine grows by virtue of human effort; that a revelation cannot be made through the medium of human language, which shall reach the minds of its recipients in the full and exact sense intended by its author—that heresies arise from the incompleteness of the original revelation—and that opinions may be made articles of faith by the Church. He supposes "there can be no doubt of the objectionable character of such doctrines;" and thus proceeds:

"The recent conversion of the author, his evident Catholic intentions, and general soundness of doctrine, would lead us to pass over these points, *all uncatholic as they are*, with a simple remark, calling the attention of our readers to their evident *heterodoxy*, were they the solitary opinions of Mr. Northcote; but they are the doctrines of a school, of a school formed, indeed, at first outside the Church, but by the conversion of its distinguished founder, Mr. Newman, and his more eminent disciples, now brought within her communion. Mr. Northcote was one of

Mr. Newman's disciples, and the fact that he still continues to be one, even within the bosom of the Church, leads us to fear the same may be the case with many others. He gives, in the extracts we have made, what we understand, and what we presume he understands, to be substantially Mr. Newman's doctrine of development. If that doctrine is entertained by the great body of those who have recently abandoned Anglicanism for the Church, the question becomes somewhat grave, and we may have, *if we are not on our guard*, before we are aware of it, a new school springing up in our midst, as dangerous as the Hermesian, or that of De Lamennais. These individuals, from their well-known talents, learning, and zeal, cannot fail to have a wide and commanding influence on our Catholic literature, and, if they adhere to Mr. Newman's doctrine, it will be diffused beyond the circle of those who now entertain it, and do no little harm to portions even of our Catholic population. The age has a strong tendency to theorizing and innovation, which Catholics themselves do not wholly escape. . . . . In this point of view, it becomes important to examine thoroughly Mr. Newman's *theory of developments*, and to lay open its real character. If it really authorize doctrines like these Mr. Northcote sets forth, *no Catholic can for a moment, after discovering the fact*, entertain it either as true or as harmless."—pp. 43, 44.

It is a feeling of duty, he assures us, which induces the reviewer to encounter "*misconstruction and odium*," in speaking "in clear and energetic tones against the advancing error," and in defending "the purity and integrity of the Catholic faith" from the attacks of "an insidious theory." It is impossible, he says, to regard Mr. Newman's book as the mere speculations of a man *in transitu* from error to truth. "Some few within contend, that the book must needs be *orthodox*, while those without insist that it is a work from which Catholic faith and theology are to be learned. The very eminence of the author gives weight to the conclusions of both."

The reviewer proceeds then to examine the principles of the "Essay on Development," and he proves (we think) conclusively, that those principles are directly subversive of the Christian revelation, independently of subverting the authority of the Church, and every thing that is built on it. We shall presently advert more particularly to his argument, but the whole view is familiar to us. The "Essay on Development" was, on its publication, denounced by many writers in the English Church as decidedly rationalistic and infidel in its principle; and, we may add, that the truth of these statements was shown by the significant fact, that the advocates of Mr. Newman's theory *have never yet attempted to meet the accusation*, but by their silence have confessed its truth. Ingenious and subtle as these disputants were, they never dared to reply to the charge of rationalism, which was

rung again and again in their ears. And the result was, that the Church of England was saved from all danger of being infected by their errors. We could all see that they were powerless to meet the charge of secret infidelity. We now revert to "Brownson's Review," from which it appears that Romanists were in 1847 beginning to find out what the whole Church of England understood tolerably well in 1845.

"The *theory of development* is professedly put forth as an hypothesis, as an expedient for removing or getting rid of a difficulty . . . which is the obstacle to seeking communion with the Church of Rome, pointed out by the author in one of the earlier numbers of the 'Tracts for the Times;' and consists in the assumption that Rome has introduced new gods, new doctrines, or, in simple terms, corrupted the primitive faith. This difficulty rests on the assumption of differences or variations between the faith presented to us by the history of the early ages of the Church, and the faith as held by the present Roman Catholic Church. But the real difficulty the author appears to hold does not end there, but resolves itself into a more general difficulty. The variations and differences have not occurred in one form of Christianity alone, but have extended to all; so that it is impossible to find any form of Christianity extant which is precisely that which we meet with in the primitive Church."—p. 46.

The reviewer remarks, that "if Mr. Newman had been a Catholic," when the theory of development was proposed, "he would not have proposed it; for no Catholic concedes there is or can be the difficulty he implies. The only variations in respect of Christian doctrine the Catholic admits are, as Father Perrone says, *new modes of expression* adopted on the occasion of novel errors."

And here arises the important question, what do the Developmentists mean by "Christian doctrine," which they assert to be developed? This is the question put by the reviewer, and he replies thus:—

"We answer, evidently, according to Mr. Newman, the view taken or the idea formed by the human mind. He connects the developments of Christian doctrine and the developments of ideas in general, supposes between them, and from the fact and necessity of the latter concludes, at least the antecedent probability of the former; which he could not do, if he did not hold Christianity to be an idea. . . . . But is the idea the revealed truth itself, or is it the view which the mind takes of the revealed truth? In some passages the author seems to teach the former: but, according to Mr. Newman, the idea is not something given to the mind *ab extra*, already formed, but is itself formed in the mind; for he defines it to be an habitual judgment of the mind, formed by comparing, contrasting, abstracting, generalizing,

adjusting, classifying.—p. 20. If, then, he takes the first alternative suggested, he must hold, as we showed in our former Article, that the revelation itself is an idea formed by the human mind, which is THE EVIDENT DENIAL OF REVELATION ITSELF."—p. 47.

The reviewer then proceeds to the other part of the alternative; viz. "that Christian doctrine is not the revealed truth itself, but the view taken, or the idea which the mind forms of it."

"This is clearly taught in the Essay, as a passage we shall soon quote fully and conclusively proves. It is supposed to be the view most favourable to Mr. Newman; and we have been accused of doing him injustice in alleging, that in some passages of his Essay he implies the other. It is evidently Mr. Northcote's understanding of his doctrine, and Mr. Northcote is good authority in the case; and, finally, we have been assured personally by an English gentleman, an acquaintance and friend of Mr. Newman, one who was with him at Littlemore, one of his warm admirers and disciples, and, like him, a convert,—a man of superior worth and intelligence,—that this is really Mr. Newman's doctrine, and that it never occurred to him that any one could understand him otherwise, or that any body did or could understand any thing else by Christian doctrine."—p. 49.

We cannot follow the reviewer through all the details of his clear exposition of the theory of development, and "the theory of Christian doctrine" included in it; but must pause for a moment on the principal results of the latter, omitting the proofs which the writer furnishes in abundance.

"1. It degrades Christianity to the level of human and heretical doctrines, and denies all *differentia generis* between them. . . . .

"2. The doctrine Mr. Newman sets forth denies that there is, properly speaking, any such thing as Christian *doctrine*. It is a contradiction in terms to call that a doctrine which is not the thing taught, but the view, or idea, or judgment, which the mind forms of it. Doctrine means, by the very force of the word itself, that which is *taught*, and *formally* taught too; for all teaching is necessarily formal, and can never be made to mean either the *materia informis* submitted to the mind, or the form the mind gives it, or judgment it forms of it. Hence, in representing the Christian revelation, objectively considered, as the mere informal matter of doctrine, and making the doctrine the form which the mind gives it, Mr. Newman denies that there is or can be a Christian doctrine."—pp. 52, 53.

Of course, if there be no Christian doctrine, the authority of the Church is at an end.

"3. The theory excludes the *ecclesia docens*, or teaching authority of the Church . . . the teacher is denied in the denial of the doctrine."

"4. It excludes *ecclesia credens*, or denies that there is any faith to be believed. This follows from the denial of the Church teaching."

In fine, it excludes the "*ecclesia judicans*," because there is no law for the judge to decide on; and the result is, that "both his theory of Christian doctrine and his theory of developments alike *exclude the infallible Church judging*, and reduce his theory to that of MERE PRIVATE JUDGMENT." Nor is this the worst: the theory "excludes even the possibility of faith, by denying, *quoad nos*, the POSSIBILITY OF AN INFALLIBLE REVELATION. This we saw in the beginning was Mr. Northcote's understanding of Mr. Newman's theory." We must pass over the proofs on which this is founded, and come to the conclusion.

"These are some of the grave objections to which Mr. Newman's theory of Christian doctrine is exposed, if, as we have conceded, it assumes Christian doctrine to be *not the revealed truth itself*, but the mind's idea of it. But if it be denied that it does so assume, and contended that it assumes the doctrine to be the revealed truth itself, it becomes, if possible, still more objectionable; for it is undeniable, that it assumes the doctrine to be *idea*, and idea to be, not something already formed communicated to the mind *ab extra*, but an habitual judgment formed by the mind itself. *This would reduce Christianity, in respect both of its matter and of its form, to the level of philosophy, and be an absolute denial of the supernatural revelation*, even of its matter; that is, *of supernatural revelation altogether*. The moment Christian doctrine is assumed to be an idea formed by the mind, an habitual judgment, whatever is assumed to be its object, Christianity, in any sense in which a Catholic can recognize it, is absolutely denied. No man *can be a Catholic*, who does not hold that Christian doctrine is the revealed truth itself; and that this truth is infallibly proposed to the mind, and infallibly received by it. If the revealed truth cannot be so proposed and so received, it is idle to talk of faith or of a Divine message. The real question Mr. Newman raises is, *not the possibility of developments, but the possibility of revelation*."—p. 58.

We have been desirous of stating fairly and fully the objections which have been raised by the literary organ of Romanism in America to Mr. Newman's theory, in order to enable the reader to understand the weight and seriousness of the charge which is made. The position of "Brownson's Review," most carefully and argumentatively supported, is, that Mr. Newman's doctrine is *subversive of the Catholic faith, and of revelation itself;* that this most dangerous doctrine is held *by a school within the Roman communion;* that it is in a position to infect *large portions of the members of that communion*. We are satisfied of the truth of these statements, although the case does not concern our apostolic Church, which has happily been delivered from the evil.

But we now proceed to the reviewer's remarks on the theory of developments, as stated by Mr. Newman. He commences by admitting developments "in government, or discipline, and *cultus exterior*;" but he proceeds:—

"With regard to doctrine, the case is different. The doctrine is the *revelata* or *credenda*, which God reveals and the Church proposes, and is the fundamental law of the Church. In this developments are not admissible, for they would imply *a growth of doctrine*, which in its turn would argue either *a deficiency* in the apostolic doctrine as formerly taught, or an excess in the doctrine formally proposed by the Church. Now developments of the law must be understood either in the sense of new enactments, or in the sense of new applications, or applications of the law to new cases which arise in the course of time and the progress of events. In the first sense they cannot be admitted without assuming *a progress in the law itself*, which is only another form of saying it was *imperfect in the beginning, contrary to the uniform teaching of Catholic theologians, who are all agreed that the law was perfect from the first, and can neither be enlarged or diminished.*"—p. 59.

The reviewer subsequently confirms this latter position in the strongest way.

"These extracts settle the fact that Mr. Newman does assert positive developments of Christian doctrine in the sense alleged. But can a Catholic admit them? Certainly not. Christian doctrine is simply and exclusively the revealed truth proposed by the Church to be believed. *We have consulted as high living authorities on the subject as there are in this country, and they all concur in saying that the Church can propose only what was revealed, and that the revelation committed to the Church was perfect.* If there be any thing in which Catholic theologians are agreed, it is in these two points,—that the revelation in the beginning was perfect, and that nothing can be proposed by the Church to be believed *fide divinâ*, not revealed from the beginning. Developments of doctrine, then, are possible only on condition that the Church has neglected her mission as a teacher, which cannot be assumed, even by way of hypothesis. Her commission was,—'Going, teach all nations . . . to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.' *It is essential to Catholic faith* to believe that she faithfully, at all times and in all places, discharges this commission. Then she must always and every where teach the whole faith, and then developments are inconceivable; for though there may be implicit believing, there is, properly speaking, no implicit or informal teaching."—pp. 66, 67.

Most unquestionably "Brownson's Quarterly" has correctly stated the position taken up by the whole body of Romish theologians and writers, whose works are now in the hands of students or of the public. They invariably assert, that the doctrines of Romanism form part of the revealed word of God, which they divide into Scripture and tradition. Certain doctrines are supposed to

have been handed down by tradition only; others are proved from Scripture; but all are supposed to have been *taught by the Apostles*. There is no essential difference in this respect amongst Romish writers, whether they write for theological students or for the common people.

The reviewer remarks, that Mr. Newman's theory is that "Christian doctrine is the human form of the revealed truth, or Divine message submitted to the action of reason;" and hence that "the informing law of the Church is not in the revelation, but in the mind of the recipient."

"We by no means assert," he continues, "that Mr. Newman would now, or when writing his book, maintain, consciously, intentionally, this abominable formula, to which his Essay is reducible; but his theory rests upon it, necessarily implies it. . . . . View it in whatever light you will, the formative power is the human agent, and therefore what in Christianity is divine, must be regarded as the matter in and with which the human agent operates,—the precise doctrine which we ascribed in our former article to Mr. Newman, and identified with Neander's, and which is readily developed into Socinianism on the one hand, and, perhaps, into justification by faith alone on the other."—p. 62.

This writer afterwards proceeds to prove that Mr. Newman plainly and distinctly teaches that the original revelation was *incomplete, e. g.* that the "Sacrament of Penance" was not included in it; that there were "*gaps*" in it; and that Christian doctrines, contradictory to heresies anathematized by the Church, were *unknown*, until these errors made their appearance.—pp. 65, 66.

The reviewer then quotes Bossuet at considerable length, who, in his controversy with the Calvinist minister Jurieu, plainly and explicitly condemns and refutes with great learning the theory of a progressive religion which that minister advocated, and which agrees, in many respects, with the theory of development. Some other authorities, such as Vincentius of Lerins, and St. Augustine and Aquinas, are quoted in confirmation of the writer's positions of the invariable nature of the deposit of revelation. He then remarks that, "whatever the view he may take of the actual developments he contends for, his view of Christian doctrine is sufficient to condemn his essay *as essentially repugnant to Catholic faith and theology*. This last we recommend to the consideration of those who are disposed to regard the theory as *extra fidem* and indifferent,—a theory which a Catholic may or may not hold, according to his own individual convictions."—p. 82.

Our readers will now have been enabled to form a judgment on the nature of the charges advanced by "Brownson's Quarterly" against the theories of Mr. Newman's school. These charges are most deliberately and carefully supported by numerous quotations

from the "Essay on Development," and by proofs gathered from a variety of sources. The Essay is proved to be, in its principles, altogether subversive of the doctrine of the Roman Church, destructive to its authority, and at variance with the very notion of a revelation.

These are most serious *charges*, to say the least of them; and now it is curious to observe the way in which they have been met by Mr. Newman's party, in their organ, the "Dublin Review." We can only say, that the mode in which the charge has been met is exactly what might have been expected from the uniform conduct of the party when they were still within the communion of their mother Church. The "Dublin Review" undertakes to answer "Brownson's Quarterly," and to defend the doctrines of Mr. Newman and his associates. But how is this done?

The article may be described in a few words. It does not attempt to invalidate or deny the truth of the representation of Mr. Newman's theories by "Brownson's Quarterly." It does not *attempt to defend those theories from the results which have been attributed to them.* It does not pretend to argue that those theories can not be subversive of Christianity. On all these points it resigns the field to "Brownson's Review." It does not venture *now*, any more than when the charge of rationalism was reiterated again and again by Churchmen, to offer any reply to the charge. The course pursued is singularly characteristic. Instead of attempting to clear the theory in any way from the tremendous charges made against it, the "Dublin Review" quietly proceeds to *put forward those theories again in the boldest way, asserting that they are the* ONLY *theories on which Romanism can be maintained;* that the contradictory theory supported by "Brownson's Quarterly" and by Bossuet is erroneous and absurd; and that certain eminent divines of the Roman Church have at times advocated views more or less resembling these theories. In fine, the reviewer professes a perfect indifference as to *consequences*, and exhorts Romanists to follow Mr. Newman's theory, no matter where it may lead them. Such, in a few words, is the defence of Mr. Newman's school against the charge of rationalistic and infidel principles. To that charge they are perfectly indifferent. They do not attempt to disprove its truth; nor do they apparently care whether it be true or not.

How perfectly do we recognize in this line of conduct the same consummate self-confidence, the same blind and unshrinking adhesion to party, and the same unbending spiritual arrogance, which we so long unhappily experienced in their evil operations upon our own communion! This spirit is now transferred to the Roman communion; and we see it flourishing there in all its

luxuriance. Romanism, like a hungry fish, has gulped down the tempting morsel, but it now begins to feel the *hook!* That party will not, we think, submit to any authority, or adopt any line of conduct, except that which they shall have themselves selected. They are not men to *yield.* They have entered the Roman communion to *teach* and to *guide* it, not to follow or obey it. They have been self-elected reformers of the English Church: they are already self-elected reformers of the Roman. The "Developmentists" bid fair to become as distinct and troublesome a party in Romanism as the "Hermesians" or the "Jansenists[1]."

We now proceed to the particulars of the reply vouchsafed by the "Developmentists" to the charges made against them. They deem it necessary to apologize for commenting on the article in "Brownson's Quarterly:"—

"It is not that we are so presumptuous as to come forward in defence of the publication which is the immediate subject of Mr. Brownson's remarks, but because that gentleman has included others in his censure who may fairly claim to be heard in their defence. With especial reference indeed to Mr. Northcote, but still with a wider scope, he speaks of '*a school* formed at first outside of the Church, but . . . now brought within her communion; and compares, in regard to their dangerousness, the principles which he considers to be held by that school on the subject of doctrinal development with those of Hermes and La Mennais.' Nor is this the charge of some obscure writer, whose censure might be regarded as little worthy of notice. Mr. Brownson's name *must be held in high honour by every Catholic.* . . . It so happened, moreover, that at the very time Mr. Brownson's article reached this country we were engaged in reviewing the treatises of Mr. Thompson and Mr. Lewis. Both these gentlemen are recent converts, and both happen to give expression to this very doctrine of 'development.' Mr. Thompson especially, in a very beautiful passage which we have quoted at length in another article."—*Dublin Review, July,* 1847, pp. 325, 326.

The writer is very uneasy at the notion of the recent converts being supposed to form "*a school.*" This appellation he does not relish; though he admits that when persons have been for a long time under the influence of the same set of influences, they may bear for a time "the general appearance of a distinct school," though they are very anxious to be "mixed up with the general Catholic body." But they disclaim the notion of being disciples of an individual; and they would abandon the theory of

[1] Mr. F. Faber, in his new series of Lives of Romish Saints, undertakes to *reprove* Romanists for the manner in which they have suppressed the miracles of saints; and the author of "Rest in the Church" openly declares, that although now a Romanist, she disbelieves some of the chief doctrines of Romanism.

development if they did not believe it to be "*implied in the continuous history of the Church's dogmatic definitions*," and "*expressly recognized by some of her greatest theologians.*"

The writer then proceeds to *state* the doctrine of development as maintained by Mr. Thompson, Mr. Lewis, and Mr. Northcote; and he pursues this statement at considerable length, drawing out the whole theory of development in a very clear and distinct manner. He then adduces certain passages from Vasquez, Petavius, Suarez, Melchior Canus, Möhler, Döllinger, De Maistre, Vincentius Lirinensis, and Cardinal Fisher, which he considers favourable to the theory of development; after which the following passage occurs:—

"We cannot here examine Mr. Brownson's *arguments*, for the simple reason that time and space will not permit. Whatever comes from him of course deserves careful attention, and, *if called upon*, we are prepared fully to meet his reasoning."—p. 350.

The reviewer then attempts to undervalue the *testimonies* adduced in "Brownson's Quarterly," and does not hesitate to throw Bossuet overboard as a schismatic or a heretic; and then, after some intervening remarks, gives expression to the following characteristic sentiments:—

"It is sometimes implied, as an objection to the principle which we have been defending, that its recognition would *tend to impair the evidence for the Divine authority of Catholic doctrine.* But in arguing with Catholics, it is surely unnecessary to say more, than that *the question is not one of probable results, but of truth or falsehood.* Catholics are charged indeed by Protestants, as the first Christians were by heathens, with deliberately 'doing evil that there may come good;' but the Catholic of the present day joins with St. Paul in his indignant repudiation of any such maxim. We must not then mis-state facts to serve a controversial purpose; and the question therefore merely recurs, on which side is the *true* statement of facts?"—p. 353.

The reviewer is "fully confident that no such result would follow;" but we certainly cannot wonder that some Romanists should look plainly at the results, and take them into account in estimating the truth of a new theory proposed to them. The "Dublin Review" tells them never to mind the consequences, even though they should result in "impairing the evidence for the Divine authority of Catholic doctrine;" *i. e.* even if they end in proving that Romanism, and Christianity itself, is a mere human invention! "Never mind," says the reviewer, "*truth* is the great object. If you attain to that, it is a matter of little consequence to you what becomes of revelation. We are 'con-

fident,' '*fully confident*,' that you will not have to relinquish your faith; but you must follow wherever this true theory of development leads you."

Whether the English Romanists will follow these "Wild Huntsmen" in their spiritual career, we cannot say: but strong symptoms of recalcitration have manifested themselves elsewhere; and "Brownson's Review" perceives an agency at work in the affair which appears to be little suspected by the too credulous Romanists at this side of the water. In allusion to the recent converts to Romanism, Brownson remarks, that "they have unhappily given the devil an opportunity to take his revenge for their defection." We see the rationalistic spirit of bold and unfettered inquiry introduced into Romanism, and we can clearly predict from experience what the effects of that spirit will be. Romanism has overreached itself in its burning anxiety to gain and to keep this party. Its ambitious hopes are destined to be followed by the severest disappointments and reverses. It will find its utmost powers tasked in the effort to exorcise the spirit which has gained a place in its communion.

We now come to the remarks offered by "Brownson's Review," in October, 1847, on the defence of Mr. Newman's doctrines in the "Dublin Review." At the commencement of these remarks the reviewer observes, that the defence proceeds from a personal friend of Mr. Newman's, and a hearty admirer of that gentleman's theory, who is not likely to misunderstand or misstate it:—

"We may, therefore, take it as a good proof of the correctness of our own statement, that it does not, in any respect whatever, object to it, *but re-asserts the theory, both in regard to Christian doctrine and development, substantially as we ourselves understood it.* We trust that this will satisfy our friends at this side of the water that we have not, as some of them have supposed, either misunderstood or misrepresented Mr. Newman.

"We understand the writer to concede the correctness of our representation of the theory of developments. If he does, he is bound either to abandon it, or to show that the consequences we deduced from it are not legitimate; for those consequences, if warranted, prove that it is subversive of Christianity. Unhappily he does neither. He has left our statement of the theory, our objections to it, and the arguments by which he has sustained them, standing in all their force. He has not even pleaded to them. Yet he cannot be unaware that he is held to concede every count in our declaration to which he does not plead, and that we have the right in reasoning with him to assume its truth. *This consideration alone sets aside his whole reply.*

"The theory of development is a special theory, resting for its logical

basis on a certain view of Christian doctrine, namely, that Christian doctrine is not the revealed truth itself, but the mind's idea of it; or that inspiration supplies only the *materia informis* of doctrine, which is rendered *doctrina formata* only by the action of the uninspired intellect,—thus degrading Christianity, by Mr. Newman's own confession, to the level of human sects and philosophies, which is, of course, to deny it. Our main objection was to this view of Christian doctrine, from which developments of doctrine are only a logical deduction; and we objected to this, not because it authorizes developments, but *because it subverts Christianity.* The reviewer, by neglecting to plead to this charge, concedes its truth, gives us the right to assume it against him, and thus throws himself out of court, or debars himself from the right to enter. He cannot introduce testimony to prove developments in the sense of his theory, because that would be to introduce testimony to disprove Christianity, which is not lawful; and to introduce it to prove developments in some other sense, would be to undertake to prove what is not in question—an instance of what logicians call *ignorantia elenchi.*

"If held to strict logic, or to the rules of legal pleading recognized by the common-law courts, both in his country and in ours, the reviewer is estopped, and cannot proceed till he gets permission to plead to the charges against the basis of his theory. Till then his authorities are of no avail; for we have only to reply, your theory is *anti-Christian,* and you are not at liberty to introduce testimony to prove any thing which is not Christian. If he rejoins, his authorities are Christian; we reply again, that they must be understood in a Christian sense, and therefore cannot be understood in the sense of your theory, for your theory is anti-Christian. In any and every possible case, it is more reasonable to suppose that he misinterprets his authorities, than that they authorize any thing against our holy religion."

Here it is pretty plain that the American reviewer holds decidedly the vantage ground. The "Development" school have not ventured to meet the charges against them; and what makes this of real interest and importance is, that such has been *uniformly their conduct whenever the charge has been made.* The Americans will never get from these gentlemen any real *defence* of their principles. The reviewer does not understand them or their policy.

"We complain of the [Dublin] reviewer that he has neglected entirely the logical basis of this theory, and *proceeds as if no objections were made to it.* We regard a theory as refuted, if refuted in its principles. . . . We feel confident that very few can examine the foundation of Mr. Newman's theory without rejecting it; and we wish especially to call the attention of his friends *to its defence,* because we think the moment they seriously attempt its defence they will abandon the theory in despair, perhaps in disgust."—p. 488.

It is precisely because these gentlemen do not want to abandon,

or even to endanger this theory, that they will not defend it. They have been a hundred times called upon to defend it from the charge of rationalism and anti-Christianism, and they have never attempted to do so. We are amused at an acute remark of the writer in "Brownson's Review."

"Our readers will observe that the names of Mr. Thompson, Mr. Lewis, and Mr. Northcote, are substituted for Mr. Newman's. Why, we must ask, is this? The article is professedly a reply to us, and our attack was directed against Mr. Newman, not against these gentlemen, save so far as they may choose to indorse and defend him. Is their theory essentially different from his? Then we have not assailed it. Is it substantially the same? Then why defend it under their name rather than his? Would they appropriate to themselves the honour that is his? *Or have they too profound a respect for him to mention his name? Or is such their estimation of the theory of development, that they would shield him from its responsibilities?*"

The reviewer, we perceive, is in some degree enlightened as to the feelings and views of the school in question.

"Our article was directed against his doctrine, as we gathered it from his essay; yet the reviewer, in replying to it, *does not once mention even his name.* Does he suppose that by suppressing Mr. Newman's name he can deprive him of the glory, or relieve him from the shame, of being the founder and chief of the school of development? However unwilling his friends may be, either for his sake or their own, that he should appear before the world as the leader of a school, he does so appear, and will, till he either obtains for his theory the sanction of authority or abandons it; and they, however great their repugnance to be called a school, will be so called, so long as the theory remains unsanctioned, and they are understood to adhere to it. The thing is so, and cannot be helped, and they need not seek to disguise it; for it is not to be presumed that any body supposes, that, if contrary to the wishes of Mr. Newman, the Church should decide the theory to be not 'coincident' with her judgment on the subject, their Catholic faith would be shaken, or they would withhold their submission. We own their present attitude towards the Church is exceedingly awkward; for they are endeavouring to persuade her to accept a theory which she has not taught, but which they devised for themselves, when *in transitu* from heresy and schism to truth and unity, and when, according to Mr. Newman, they could use 'only reason in the things of faith;' but it is an attitude of their own choosing, and are they the men to shrink from its responsibility?"—pp. 488, 489.

The reviewer then remarks that he has examined the statement of the "Dublin Review" with what ability he possesses; that he understands the doctrine of the "Dublin Review" to be *substantially*

the same as that ascribed to Mr. Newman; and that the article has thus been already refuted.

We cannot follow the reviewer through his examination of the various authorities produced by the "Dublin Review" in support of developmentism, but shall touch on a few of the more interesting points. He remarks that Mr. Newman and his school have roved through the multitude of the doctors of the Church, seized on their private opinions, and *obiter dicta*, and "generalized them into a theory to be henceforth taken as the sense of Catholic doctors, and *the recognized doctrine of the Church of God.*" That their claims take no lower range than this, the reviewer proves by an extract from the "Dublin Review," where, in speaking of theory of development, that periodical says:—

"In fact it is only in accordance with, it is only an instance of, the very principle we have been contending for, that development should be developed; that a principle on which the Church has ever proceeded [unconsciously for the most part, pp. 300, 301], and which her greatest doctors have *from time to time* recognized and fully allowed, should *at last*, by the progress of controversy, have been drawn forth into a *consistent and systematic theory.*"—p. 352.

Churchmen will fully sympathize with the following expressions of "Brownson's Review," in which a just indignation is expressed at the reckless and scandalous mode of argument employed by the "Dublin Review" and other advocates of this theory, in reference to the great mysteries of Christianity:—

"The first class of developments described, but taken for granted, and those which scandalize us the most, because they strike at the mystery of the Trinity, the foundation of the Christian profession, are those on which Mr. Newman places the greatest reliance, and from which he draws the principal illustrations of his theory. . . . To assume, as the reviewer does, (p. 329,) that the doctrine of the Trinity was only imperfectly understood and believed before the Nicene Council; to assert of the Ante-Nicene fathers generally, that in treating this holy mystery they erred in thought and expression, held opinions subsequently condemned by the Church, and yet were far from 'doctrinal error;' and to assume such a horrible doctrine as a matter of course, as a thing which will be admitted without controversy, is presuming a little too much on the ignorance, stupidity, or indifference of the Catholic public. It is not less scandalous than the reason the reviewer assigns, near the close of his article, why his theory, as some have objected, will not impair the evidence of Christianity; namely, that the argument it impairs can affect only a limited class of persons! (p. 353) that is, the *ignorant* may have as good evidence as they had before!"—pp. 493, 494.

The reviewer makes the following statement of the doctrine of his Church in opposition to the "Developmentists." The statement appears to us perfectly correct:

"The Catholic doctrine, on the subject under discussion, as it has been taught us, is, that our Lord has made a full and perfect revelation of all that is, or is to be, received *de fide*, and that He has instituted his Church, and committed to her this revelation as a sacred deposit, to be preserved and transmitted without addition, diminution, or alteration; and that with regard to it, *assistente Spiritu Sancto*, she exercises the functions of an infallible *witness* and *teacher*, and an infallible judge of all controversies which arise respecting it in space and time."—p. 516.

After referring to Vincentius Lirinensis, the reviewer continues:

"It is not possible for language to be more explicit, and on this point *we have found no disagreement among our theologians;* and their uniform doctrine is admirably summed up and set forth by our own theologian, the learned and venerable Bishop of Philadelphia, in his excellent Theologia Dogmatica, vol. i. pp. 221—228, where he gives, in establishing *the perpetuity of the faith*, as conclusive a refutation of the theory of development as any one can desire. Father Perrone clearly sustains the doctrine we set forth; *so does the learned and scientific Dr. Wiseman.* Indeed, the point is of faith, and not debatable; for the holy Council of Trent, session 4, in the Decree on the Canon, expressly declares that those things, and those only, can be held of faith, which are contained 'in libris scriptis, aut sine scripto traditionibus, quæ ipsius Christi ore ab Apostolis acceptæ, et ab ipsis Apostolis, Spiritu Sancto dictante, *quasi per manus traditæ, ad nos usque pervenerunt.*' No ingenuity can possibly develop transmitting a doctrine from the Apostles to us, as it were by hand, into development. *Handing* down a doctrine can never be developing it."—pp. 517, 518.

This is perfectly crushing. The "Developmentists" will not answer arguments of this kind, because they cannot and dare not. They are already in secret released from allegiance to the Church of Rome, as they were from the English Church for years, before they openly forsook its communion. The decree of Trent is diametrically opposed to their whole theory. Will they attempt again openly to propose a "non-natural sense?"

We must now pass on to another passage in which "Brownson's Review" is equally successful in depicting the views of the recent converts to Romanism:

"We shall do these gentlemen essential injustice, if we interpret their theory from the Catholic, instead of the Protestant, point of view.

They assume, in the outset, that all which Protestants allege as to *Roman additions to the primitive creed* IS TRUE, only that what Protestants call *additions*, should be called *developments*. They agree precisely with their former Anglican friends on the main point, that there are doctrines to be found in the Church's teaching to-day, which were not in her primitive teaching. *Their theory is an expedient for asserting the Anglican antecedent, and escaping the Anglican consequent.* On the main point controverted between Protestants and Catholics, for these three hundred years, as to these pretended additions, they take, as they always did, the Anglican side, and are, as before, at issue with all our Catholic divines. Here, say they, are the facts. The *stationariness* of doctrines contended for by Roman divines cannot be maintained with truth; and you must either call these facts additions with Anglicans, or developments with us. If you call them additions, you must renounce your Church. The evidence of history is overwhelming against you: *it is either our theory, or no Catholicity.* This is the alternative these modest gentlemen present to the Catholic Church. Let them deny it if they can."—p. 523.

The "Developmentists" were (as might have been expected) by no means inclined to yield the victory to the advocates of the old system of argument, which their sagacity had pronounced no longer tenable. Accordingly, in January, 1848, the "Dublin Review" returns to the charge. It fears, modestly, that the discussion will "prove rather *uninteresting*, except to those who take a lively interest in the question at issue." The "Dublin Review" is annoyed that its earnest "*protest* against the term 'school,' applied to certain recent converts from Anglicanism," has not been accepted; and endeavours to console itself by finding out that "Brownson's Review" does not attribute to this "school" *perfect agreement*, or *clear and precise views* of what they are contending for.—p. 375.

After a strong re-assertion of the principle of development, as a principle "as *old* as Catholic theology itself," (the reviewer here seems anxious to claim it as a doctrine of *Revelation*,) and as maintained by all "Catholic writers;" the Dublin reviewer affirms, that there are other principles equally universal among Catholics, which appear, at first sight, almost *inconsistent* with the former, viz., that Christian truth was only promulgated by Christ and his Apostles; and that later doctors of the Church have not had greater insight into the Gospel than the Apostles themselves.

The reviewer then says that several writers of the Roman communion, especially in the last two centuries, "have" so dwelt upon the two latter principles, as "*to withhold its due weight from the former*," *i.e.* from *development* (p. 376); rather a curious ad-

mission as regards the teaching of the Romish Church, which is thus considered to have been *defective* for the last two centuries. The reviewer then states that "Mr. Brownson *has said nothing which even tends towards inducing us to change*" the theory of development asserted in the "Dublin Review." Of course! who that knows them, could have anticipated any concession from the school of development?

The reviewer next accounts for his not attempting to reply to "Brownson's Review." "He did not *profess* to reply to Mr. Brownson's article. What in the world have we to do with Mr. Newman's book, or any thing it contains . . . Our *admiration* of the work is most sincere and profound; *but who are we, that we should take* on ourselves to defend it?"—p. 377.

The "Developmentists" thus ingeniously *avoid* any attempt to answer the arguments of "Brownson's Review" against their theory. Although their professed object in the "Dublin Review" is to *maintain* the doctrine in question, and to re-assert it; at the same time noticing the various arguments from *authority* adduced by Brownson, they deem it most prudent to avoid any discussion on the general character and results of the theory itself. They meet *one half* of his argument, and leave the remainder unanswered, under pretence that the matter belongs to Mr. Newman. Do not the *authorities* touch on Mr. Newman's theory quite as much as the more purely *theological* part of the question?

In the second article on the subject, which is to be followed by a third, the same course is pursued. The whole discussion is made to turn, not on the general character and tendencies of the theory, but on certain quotations from Romish divines, which the "Dublin Review" puts forth as including its theory, and which "Brownson's Quarterly" views differently. As to the general principles of the theory, they are in no case defended. We cannot attempt to carry the reader through the wranglings of those disputants on the meaning of particular quotations from school divines. It is remarkable, however, that none of the common books of theology, or the generally circulated treatises of controversy, are cited. The authorities are dragged out of authors whose works are *not in the hands of the Romanists at the present day*, and to which they cannot refer easily. *We are never referred* to the writings of Milner, Wiseman, Hornyhold, Delahogue, Bailly, *and the common books in circulation* amongst Romanists; yet those who have been instructing the Roman Catholic Church for the last century, must be fit and proper exponents of her doctrine. We can very readily believe that theories inconsistent with the general belief of Romanists at the present day, have been occasionally advanced by their theologians in former times; but we should have thought

that if the *actual doctrine of the Church of Rome* on this subject had been the object of inquiry, the reference should have been to the Council of Trent, and to all the current teaching in the schools at the present day, and to all the publications of Roman Catholic divines expounding the doctrines of their Church, for the benefit of "schismatics" or "heretics."

As the matter stands at present, we have the "Dublin Review" and the development school on the one side, asserting *positively* that Romanism has at all times recognized their theories, and that no other theories will suffice for the defence of Romanism. We have, on the other side, "Brownson's Review," backed by certain ecclesiastical authorities in America, denouncing the whole theory as *antichristian and heretical*, and asserting that the *uniform teaching* of the Roman Catholic Church is diametrically opposed to it, and that it is condemned by the Council of Trent. This dispute is certainly a very grave one—the most serious that has commenced in the Church of Rome for a long series of years. It is now at least, plain, that controversies of a very important character are not peculiar to the Church of England. Those who may know little of the disputes on Jansenism or Hermesianism in the Roman Church, can very well see and understand the nature of the controversy now proceeding in that Church,—a controversy which affects the *very foundations* of the Christian faith!

We can look on in quiet, and witness the progress of the conflagration, for our own communion is happily freed from it. We trust that results most beneficial to the cause of truth will ensue.

Romanism has now begun to taste the bitter fruits of the conversion of men, who it had vainly imagined were destined to restore the whole Church of England to the fold of the pretended "vicar of Jesus Christ." The utter failure of these ambitious hopes, which were never further from realization than at this moment, has now been followed by grave internal dissensions, excited by these much coveted converts! We do not much envy Dr. Wiseman's position at the present moment. Will he prevent Mr. Newman and his friends from openly agitating the Roman communion with their theories? Will he exact from them any condemnation of any of their theories? Will he prevent them from writing in the "Dublin Review?" Are they, in short, to be *silenced*, and put under some kind of disgrace in Romanism, as they were in the English Church? If so, we do not feel any confidence of their remaining Romanists. According to them, their theories are the *only* ground on which Romanism can be defended. *Can* they submit to be silenced, or prevented from advocating those

views? Can they consistently do so, and allow what they believe to be a false and an absurd theory to reign undisputed amongst Romanists? They united themselves to Romanism *on their theory of development;* can they possibly submit to have that theory virtually denounced as erroneous? Supposing them to be prevented from publicly advocating what they believe to be the truth, what would be their opinion of the care of the Roman Church for *the truth?* This has always been their great ground of confidence in Romanism. They have always believed that the care of the Church of Rome for *Catholic truth* is vigilant, unceasing, and uniform. How would this be in their opinion, if they were prevented from openly inculcating the doctrine of development, which they believe to be a *Catholic truth*, and merely for fear of giving offence to those who hold the contrary false doctrine of *stationariness?* If they should concede this, what would become of their own zeal for truth and for Romanism? Our own opinion is,—we have not the slightest wish for the event,—that in case of any repression of their doctrine, *we should have them all back again* in a very short time. We say we do not wish for this; for, being such as they are, we prefer to see them *where* they are. We would rather see the conflagration rage in hostile communions than in our own: we do not covet them, because we know them.

Let us take another supposition. Let us suppose that the "Developmentists" are not in any way reduced to silence, but allowed by Dr. Wiseman and the Romish authorities in England to proceed in their career. Suppose them still to hold possession of the "Dublin Review," and to circulate their principles in every way through the country; what will be the effect? We do not speak so much of the mere influence of their opinions over the Romish population, though this must be considerable, because Mr. Newman even already holds a position, in point of character and personal influence, second to no member of the Romish communion: he will, in the natural course of things, be very soon appointed a "vicar apostolic," or a "bishop:" it will be impossible to keep back such a man from the highest offices in the Romish communion, if there be no impediment offered by his doctrine. But, then, if this school is permitted to hold the sway which it now exercises over the Romanists of England, and to continue the bold and open publication of its views, we cannot conceive it possible to prevent divisions and controversies of the most formidable character in the Romish communion generally. What will Romanists in England think, and what will the English Church and the various opponents of Romanism think, when they see doctrines which have been openly and deliberately

charged, *in the Church of Rome itself*, with heresy and infidelity, fully sanctioned and allowed by Dr. Wiseman and the Romish hierarchy in England? Who would trust himself to the instruction of such a Church? What would become of the zeal of the Romish Church for the maintenance of the faith, if she allowed her doctrines to be inculcated on *diametrically opposite principles;* and if she took *no notice* of charges of heresy and rationalism made against a school within her communion? And again, Romanism in America is thoroughly roused on the subject. "Brownson's Review," while noticing the opposition which many Romanists made to any censure of Mr. Newman's views, observes that they would have shrunk from the painful task, "*if they were not encouraged and sustained by those who have authority to teach.*" The censure of Mr. Newman's work does not proceed from a mere reviewer, but from ecclesiastical authorities in the Romish communion in America. While the theory of development is openly advocated, we cannot think that controversy on the subject will cease. It has been opened in so serious a manner, and has been put on such grounds, that we do not see how it can be repressed by any thing less than the interference of the very highest ecclesiastical authority in their communion.

The question will then occur,—will both parties be directed to hold their tongues by the pope? We think this will be the case, though the world will not hear any thing about the matter. The authorities, we think, will try to hush the matter up, and to permit no more controversy. They will endeavour to soothe both parties, and to keep things as quiet as they may. The controversy will thus seem to die a natural death, and it will be represented that there was no real difference between the combatants, —that they did not differ about articles of faith.

Well, be it so. Doubtless the policy of the Church of Rome is a very subtle one. To retain power and influence at all hazards, even at the sacrifice of truth, is her object. She does not condemn the development school—for fear of losing them. Their principles are destructive of her theology. Never mind: they will be *tolerated;* but—they must not make an *uproar*, so as to "give the devil an opportunity to take his revenge for their defection."

What may be exactly the course which the subtle and tortuous policy of Rome will take to avert the dangerous controversy which has arisen, we cannot, of course, say. Whatever it may be, however, what has already occurred is a most seasonable addition to the argument against Romanism. Let us briefly survey the subject in its bearing upon the controversies of the day.

Romanism, therefore, presents itself to us at this present

moment loudly proclaiming and boasting that its doctrines are infallibly certain,—that Divine Revelation has been entrusted to it alone; and that every one who does not submit to its authority will go to hell. Romanism is uniformly and increasingly vehement in the assertion of these claims; but when it attempts to prove the truth of these assertions, it becomes suddenly self-contradictory to the most extravagant pitch of absurdity.

"Our doctrine was, beyond doubt, taught by Jesus Christ to his Apostles, and from them has been handed down, without the least addition or innovation, to the present day; therefore it is the only true faith.—We *deny* this positively. Our doctrine was only taught in its outline to the Apostles. There were great defects in the original revelation, and the human mind has made large *additions* to the original stock of doctrines in the course of ages, which the Church has placed amongst her articles of faith."

"St. Peter was prince of the Apostles, and exercised papal jurisdiction over them; therefore you ought now to obey the pope.—No; we are altogether wrong in our premises. The papacy did not exist in those times; it did not rise till centuries after."

"Protestants have no kind of foundation for their assertions, that Romanism is in many respects a novelty,—that the worship of saints, and the Virgin, and images, &c., was not known in the primitive times.—Nay, the Protestants are *quite right* on these points; it is only our divines who have been in error: all these matters are developments."

These two contradictory voices both issue simultaneously from the Romish Church.—Which are we to believe? Where is the infallible judge of doctrine to inform us who is telling truth and who is telling falsehood?

Is *this*, then, "Romish unity?" Has it come to this, that after three centuries of controversy, Romanists cannot tell whether their doctrines are apostolical traditions or inventions of yesterday—cannot tell whether Protestantism is right or wrong in its allegations—cannot tell, in short, whether the Church of Rome is or is not the pillar and ground of the truth? And is this that region of infallible certainty in matters of faith, which dreamers anticipated when they forsook the communion of their mother Church? What becomes of the name of "Catholic," as employed by Romanists, when they cannot agree on such vital and fundamental points? can a Church which is split thus down to its foundation be a safeguard or protector?

The errors of Romanism may be demonstrated from the positions advanced by the two Romish parties who are now in controversy.

We assume then as our fundamental principle, the doctrine which is laid down so clearly by "Brownson's Review," and which

is broadly and openly taught in almost every Romish publication which is now in circulation. This principle is, that God has made his revelation once for all—made it by his Son, and by the holy Apostles—and that it has *never since been added to*,—that our Lord has made a full and perfect revelation of all that is, or is to be received *de fide*, and that He has instituted his Church, and committed to her this revelation as a sacred deposit, to be preserved and transmitted without *addition*, *diminution*, or *alteration*.—(p. 516.) Additions to the faith are therefore unlawful; and to assume, as the author of the "Essay on Development" and his disciples have done, "That Rome has introduced new gods, new doctrines, or in other words corrupted the primitive faith"(p. 46), would be to admit problematically, that, which if it were *real*, "*there could be no solution of it but in the rejection of the Church;* and just so far as the author assumes it to be real, *he yields the whole question to the Protestant.*"—p. 82.

How stands the case then, according to the confessions of the "Developmentists?"

I. There can be no doubt that the *papal supremacy* is *now* an *article of faith* in the Romish Church. If therefore this did not form part of the original institution of Jesus Christ, but was devised in after ages, it is an *addition* to the faith.

Now let us hear the "Developmentists:"—"While Apostles were on earth," says Mr. Newman, "there was need neither of bishops nor pope; their power was dormant, or exercised by Apostles. *In course of time*, first the power of the bishops awoke, and then the power of the pope. . . . When the Church was thrown upon her own resources, first local disturbances gave rise to bishops, and next œcumenical disturbances *gave rise to popes; and whether communion with the pope was necessary to Catholicity, would not, and could not be debated*, till a suspension of that communion had actually occurred. . . . . It is a less difficulty *that* the papal supremacy *was not formally acknowledged in the second century*, than that there was no formal acknowledgment of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity till the fourth."—(*Essay on Development*, pp. 166, 167.) This writer adds, that the "papacy *began* to form" as soon as persecution ceased, that is, in the fourth century. He admits, without difficulty, the force of Barrow's reasoning, that in primitive times the papal supremacy did not, and could not exist.—*Ibid*, pp. 168, 169.

This is quite sufficient for our purpose. Here is an authority obtruded on the Church as a portion of Revelation,—as an institution of Jesus Christ, which, it is admitted, did not begin to be formed till some centuries after the time of our Lord!

II. There can be no doubt that the *worship of saints and angels*

is now recognized in the Church of Rome, as a part of the Catholic faith—part of the original deposit extended to the Church by Jesus Christ, and handed down by tradition.

The "Developmentists" tell us a very different tale from this. According to Mr. Newman, this worship was introduced in the course of the *fourth* and *fifth* centuries after Christ. "The treatment of the Arian and Monophysite errors . . . . . became the natural introduction of the *cultus sanctorum*."—(*Essay on Development*, p. 400.) The worship of the Virgin began in the fifth century. "There was, in the first ages, *no public recognition* of the place which St. Mary holds in the economy of grace; this was reserved for the *fifth* century."—*Ibid.* p. 245.

III. The worship of *images* is put forth by the Church of Rome as part of the original deposit of the faith.

Hear "developmentism:"—"The introduction of images was still later [than the fifth century], and met with more opposition in the West than in the East." It was one of "the further developments of the *eighth* century."—*Essay on Development*, p. 362.

IV. The doctrine of purgatory has become an article of faith in the Romish Church.

According to Mr. Newman and his school, it arose considerably after the time of the Apostles. "Thus we see how, as time went on, the doctrine of purgatory was opened upon the apprehension of the Church, as a portion or form of penance for sins committed after baptism. And thus *the belief in this doctrine*, and the practice of infant baptism *would grow into general reception together*." —(*Essay on Development*, p. 245.) So that the doctrine of purgatory was an addition to the primitive faith.

This is what we have been maintaining for three centuries in opposition to all the learning, subtlety, worldly wisdom, and power of the Church of Rome. We have been upholding the Gospel *once revealed;* the Gospel comprised in those sacred books which all Christendom from the beginning acknowledged as the divinely-inspired record of their faith; and we have laboured, while clasping to our hearts those sublime truths concerning the Trinity and Incarnation, and those other great articles of the Christian faith which supported the martyrs in their sufferings, to preserve the worship of the Triune God from all association with those foul and idolatrous forms of worship which Romanism had introduced into the Christian Church. Of that testimony we are not ashamed. The faults of the Reformation have been manifold, and they have been severely visited; but the cause is essentially that of Christianity against Heathenism, and we fear we must add against Infidelity. As time has gone on, each year

has shown more and more strongly the essential heathenism which is included in the worship of the Church of Rome. *That* element it is which, since the restoration of the papal power in 1814, has most distinctly and awfully revealed itself. And now, perhaps, we are to see the results in a way which the infatuated advocates of Rome have little expected. Their boundless aspirations, and their consummate confidence are, perhaps, to be rebuked, ere long, by the hand of God. But we forbear to enter on the solemn subject which here opens upon us. We must only express our gratitude, that in times when God's judgments are abroad, the Church of England has stedfastly maintained the full and undiminished faith which the Apostles of Jesus Christ delivered, and the early Church sealed with its blood,—maintained it unmixed with the inventions of human wisdom, or with the worship of created beings.

Art. VII.—*Letters of Dr. M'Hale to Lord Arundel, Lord Shrewsbury, and Lord John Russell.*

In our early days, we flattered ourselves that we understood something of the nature and mutual obligations of government; we believed that "the powers that be are ordained of God;" that it is the duty of a king to rule his subjects for their protection; to punish wickedness and vice; and to maintain true religion and virtue. We believed also, that as kings are only fallible men, it is necessary to restrain them by constitutional rules; but that the power to enforce and execute the law is the gift of God, and that to support and uphold that authority is the duty of every good Christian and every loyal subject. Modern improvements, however, seem to have exploded all such theories; rebellion is defined by a late writer to be the dissent of a few from the decision of the many; our sovereign is no longer a ruler by hereditary right, but the accepter of a minister nominated by the Commons. Public opinion, therefore, is now the real governor of this country; on all hands it seems to be admitted that the will of the majority is supreme law, and that every nation has an undoubted right to govern itself, irrespective of any pre-supposed powers of God or the king.

At present, no body of men are so clamorous for the right of self-government as the Irish; they want a parliament of their own, or, in other words, that a majority of those who lead and express public opinion in the island, shall have the power of binding the rest by their decisions; and that there shall be no longer an appeal to the higher tribunal of public opinion as expressed in the larger and more respectable assembly of the English representatives. But before the English nation gives its consent to such a measure, it would be, at least, justice to consider what is the state of public opinion in Ireland, and to what sort of assembly the regulation of the province would be entrusted, if the legislative union were repealed—how far the governing body would respect the laws of God—and how far the rights of life, of liberty, and of property would be secured to her Majesty's subjects. The answers to these questions will form a test of the fitness of Ireland to undertake the responsibility of self-government, and by them we can easily ascertain what position she would hold among nations, were she entrusted with distinct national independence. There are two indices of public opinion

by which the tendency of the governing power may be learned; the first is, the direct voice of representatives chosen to express the sentiments of their constituents, and who are protected by law in the exercise of their right to speak and vote in parliament; these men, or a section of them, of course show a state of public opinion in proportion to their numbers; they may be few, but we must recollect, that without some thousands each to agree with them outside the House, their voice in the legislature could never have been heard. The second index is the public press—(the editorial articles) the letters now under our consideration could never have appeared in print, without the expectation of numerous readers. One letter leads to many, either in praise or opposition; and we may, therefore, fairly draw an inference as to the state of public opinion in Ireland, from the articles written and read in the newspapers of the day.

The first object with a large portion of the Irish public seems to be the repeal of the sixth Commandment; God has said, "Thou shalt do no murder;" but Ireland often says, as far as she can, consistently with the stronger power of England, that murder is justifiable. During the late short session of Parliament, Lord John Russell brought forward a very moderate measure for strengthening the police force, and disarming the peasantry in disturbed districts, and immediately a part of the governing power of Ireland cries out that it is unjust. One leader, who was returned for two constituencies, and therefore expresses a double portion of popular feeling, declares "he would die on the floor of the House" before it should pass into law. Though the laugh was against him, and he has been treated as a fool, yet such an expression would never have escaped from Mr. John O'Connell, had he not felt that his supporters object to the increased powers of the law, and prefer the right of shooting their landlords at their own convenience. In his opposition to the Coercion Bill, Mr. O'Connell was followed by about eighteen Irish and one English member: now, supposing one or two of his party absent (as not more than half the Irish members voted), this gives us about a fifth of the voice of Ireland asserting the indefeasible right of killing their neighbours, and denying the power of the English Government to protect property and life. A fifth of a popular assembly is but a small part; but let us recollect that twenty years ago there would not have been a twentieth: that this party rightly expect to be the dominant body in College-green; that their numbers may be easily increased by the adhesion of country gentlemen like Mr. Richard Fox; that ambition to obtain a seat in Parliament may make many vote against their principles as he has done; that, as soon as the fifth

shall be a little more than doubled in an Irish parliament, the voice of the advocates for murder will be the law of the land. Mr. O'Connell is already taking steps to increase his force; he has denounced Mr. Grattan and Mr. Dillon Browne, who voted with ministers, plainly telling them and the world, that those who represent Meath and Mayo must vote with him, and not prevent the people from using their arms. Mr. O'Connell's letters are all to the same effect; he talks of the necessity for "some change in the law, which will put a stop to the mutual murders by landlord and tenant."

Dr. M'Hale, in his letter to Lord John Russell, dated "Feast of St. Thomas of Canterbury, 1847" (rather an ominous sound where the archbishop disputes the power of the Crown), says—

"The cruel fate of those victims of murder we deeply lament. The misdeeds of those who robbed them of that life which can never be restored we abhor, and over their inhuman authors we cease not to grieve from our inmost souls. But whilst we deplore and stigmatize murder as drawing down the vengeance of Heaven on all who counsel or encourage such a dreadful crime, we can have no sympathy with that hypocritical sentimentality which affects such horror for the loss of life of a few individuals, and can view the silent slaughter of thousands without a particle of commiseration."

This clearly follows up Dr. M'Hale's former position in his letter to Lord Arundel, in which he asserts the right of the clergy to denounce any individual who may not be amenable to his spiritual authority.

"It is not to extenuate crime; that is out of the question; but within the range of lawful regimens, it might as well be said that the ordinary dietary suited to a sound man, is also fitted for one in the last state of sickness and exhaustion, as that the same course of instruction and discipline adapted to the well-adjusted relations of English society would be equally efficacious in restoring the shattered frame of society in Ireland. All I can say is, that from all your lordship could read and hear of their cruelties, the ordinary, the every-day recurring cruelties endured by the Irish peasantry, and inflicted by those from whose position and education some humanity should be expected, you would have no idea of the state of Ireland, or the difficult and anomalous position in which the Catholic clergy are placed. It is a state of which I pray your lordship will continue ignorant in England, to the benefit of the people, and the honour of their aristocracy and gentry. But whilst I sincerely wish you the continuance of this comparatively happy state, I beg, in return, to claim some indulgence for the position of those who are not similarly favoured. The clergy of Ireland may adopt a line of conduct, which, however within the pale of Catholic discipline as well as the constitution, may appear somewhat strange, nay, utterly unaccountable to their brethren in England. It may be—and I own it is the

case—that their conduct, strictly within the laws of propriety too, would appear equally strange to those on this side of the Channel in some circumstances. I have not the least doubt but many of those who thus view each other's conduct with equal surprise, would change their line of conduct if they were to exchange their mutual positions. And yet to neither one or the other should I impute inconsistency or any subserviency either to popular or aristocratic influences unworthy of their order. No, my lord; in those reflections I am only feebly copying those precepts of wisdom to which the ancient fathers of the Church, and especially the great Gregory, gave expression. He tells us that the mode and topics of address suited to one may not be applicable to another. He illustrates this judicious and seasonable variety of treatment by a reference to the different state of human constitution, and the same may be said of different states of society.

"Public denunciations of persons by name, whatever be their misdeeds, are not the practice in Ireland. The duties, however, of all, without exception, as they are contained in the code of Christian morality, come within the legitimate sphere of the priest's instructions. With regard to the observation of some not being amenable to the discipline of the Catholic church, I have only to remark that justice and humanity do not exclusively belong, or at least should not, to any peculiar body of Christians, and that the inculcation of those duties should form the theme of every pastor's instructions. True, the Catholic pastor cannot subject the violators of justice or humanity not belonging to the Catholic church to its rigorous penances and satisfactions, but that does not preclude his right of denouncing aggressions on the rights of justice and humanity belonging to his flock from any quarter. Such was the feeling, such, too, the practice, of the ancient fathers, who denounced the cruelties and persecutions of pagans and heretics against their flocks without thinking they were guilty of any inroad on the rights of others."

As far as we can understand the facts of Major Mahon's case (above alluded to) among so many contradictions they are these: Mr. M'Dermot, the parish priest, disagreed with Major Mahon on some matter relating to the poor. The priests of course, as a body, have no interest in keeping down the rates, as they hold no land, but they have a direct interest in raising them, as their support is derived from the poor, and the more the paupers can obtain from the poor-rate, the more they will be able to give to the priest. Shortly after, a friend of Major Mahon's, a Roman Catholic, told him that Father M'Dermot had denounced him from the altar. We suppose, from the strong denials which have since appeared, that the name was not mentioned, but allusions and descriptions are quite as forcible as names. He spoke of Major Mahon's oppressions of the poor, and concluded his speech with these emphatic words: "This man is worse than Cromwell, and he lives." Within two days, Major Mahon was murdered.

Dr. M'Hale, who, of course, is surrounded by his own flatterers, only takes his own side of the question, and asserts the right of a priest to denounce oppression, saying that the state of Ireland is very different from England, and therefore requires very different treatment; in other words, that circumstances justify Mr. M'Dermot in his denunciations, and circumstances excuse the murderer of Major Mahon. The sensation which these and other letters produced in England was entirely different from what the writers expected; they had told the truth without intending it, that the Repeal party in Ireland, with the Roman Catholic clergy at their head, are ready to aid and abet the murderer just so far as the law will not hold them personally responsible, and that, whatever crime may be committed, they will excuse the peasant, and throw the blame upon the Saxon oppressor. The party then took another turn; when "the Lion of the fold of Judah" (as Dr. M'Hale is profanely called) had failed in his purpose of justifying Mr. M'Dermot, and when the English press joined in the outcry against him, Dr. Browne, the Roman Catholic Bishop of Elphin, (whom O'Connell surnamed the Dove,) comes forward and denies the whole charge. This denial, however, has come too late, as all England, except those who are wilfully blind, now believe that Major Mahon owed his death to the denunciations of the parish priest. Had the Roman Catholic bishops known their own interest, they would at once have called M'Dermot to account, and then have removed or suspended him; but the attempt to justify his acts has placed the whole system in its true light, and shown that the Irish murders are not mere outbreaks of revenge from an injured peasant, but that the murderer is only an instrument in the hands of an organized party who have their own objects, and are determined to carry them at all hazards. To show the spirit of this party we quote a few paragraphs from some of their journals. The "Nation" of the 24th of December, 1847, thus commences its leading article:

"There have been no murders for three weeks. The pretence for the coercion bill is gone—but the coercion bill itself remains."—*Nation.*

"The oppression of the landlord class is the natural parent of agrarian crime.

"A few landlords have been slain by the hand of assassins, whose guilt no man can palliate; and the whole empire has been moved, and the executive has been armed with unusual power to prevent a repetition of the crime; thousands and tens of thousands of the poor have been slain, and not an effort is being made to avert a repetition of the slaughter."
—*Weekly Freeman's Journal, Jan.* 1, 1848.

This latter journal seems to keep in type a set of words, "Saxon

thugs hounded on against the Catholic clergy." "English misrule and Irish misfortune." "The English press could not do less than halloo its moral assassins, the thugs of the dice-room, on the priests," &c. &c. All this, and much more, is in the same style as the celebrated speech of Archdeacon Laffan, who tells his audience that nothing but the want of personal courage prevents the English from being murderers as well as the Irish, and that if they were only used half as badly they would resent it in a much more savage manner.

Though late events have turned the current of public feeling in England, and attention is now drawn to the elements of discord which are at work in Ireland, we only wonder that the event had not sooner arrived. Let any one look over the Irish radical papers for the last twenty years, and see the way in which agrarian outrages have been treated, and he must be convinced that the readers of these papers are advocates of the system. Thus, when the conservative papers usually give a list of outrages under the head of "state of the country," we see in the opposition press the same facts headed "state of the country journals." And then as above, "murder is certainly inexcusable, but we do not wonder, where the poor are goaded to madness by oppression, that they take the only means of relieving themselves by the wild justice of revenge." "A single murderer is hanged, and perhaps he deserves it; but what shall we say of the legal murderer of thousands who exterminates his tenants, and then leaves them to die of starvation?" The late Mr. O'Connell often told his hearers that there were two evils in Ireland, landlord murder and clearance slaughter; and when Lord Norbury, a kind-hearted and improving landlord, was shot on the 1st of January, 1839, in his own demesne, Mr. O'Connell first spoke of the various oppressions of which he had been guilty, and then threw the blame on Lord Norbury's own son, saying, that no peasant ever committed the deed, that the foot-mark bore the trace of a gentleman's boot, and that he who had the greatest interest in the death of the deceased, was most likely to have been the assassin. For several weeks, his great subject was abuse of Lord Oxmantown, the friend of Lord Norbury, who carried on the investigation; thus drawing off attention from the murder to the person who was seeking for the truth; he denounced him as the slanderer of his country, said he was taking every means to screen the guilty, and impeach the innocent, and loudly called upon the government to dismiss him from the magistracy. The people of Ireland understood their leader well, the newspapers wrote up the principle, and agrarian outrages continued unchecked.

But while the Repeal party thus agree in the attack made upon

the property of the country, while they agree in calling murder the wild justice of revenge, and stimulate an ignorant peasantry with a history of wrongs real or imagined, we must not suppose that there are no shades and degrees of party among them. They present certainly a bold and formidable front at a distance, but on nearer inspection we find them split into factions among themselves, agreeing indeed in hatred to England, thirst for plunder, and anxiety for a revolution, but differing considerably as to the means by which they propose to attain these desirable ends. Daniel O'Connell was the general who led his forces to victory, he organized them in the struggle for emancipation, and he continued at their head after his object was attained. To keep up his power and levy his tribute it was necessary to open a new question, and this induced him to raise the cry of Repeal of the Union. At his death, however, rival leaders have sought in vain for his supremacy, and, like the successors of Alexander the Great, in the struggle for pre-eminence, the empire is dismembered. There are at present at least three parties among the Irish repealers, each expressing its opinions through its natural organs, the daily and weekly newspapers; let us observe the state of public feeling in each. In the first place we have the old Romish party which is represented by the Conciliation Hall, and guided by the priests and bishops, who now style themselves "the Catholic Hierarchy of Ireland." They have assumed a tone of superiority to all law, and hold themselves quite above reproof or question. We extract the following from Dr. M'Hale's letter to Lord Shrewsbury, dated "The Feast of the Chair of St. Peter, 1848."

"The staff, too, is for winning back, for sustaining the weary, and sometimes, but seldom, thank God! is there any such necessity, for correcting proud and incorrigible delinquents.

"It is on those great occasions, when the sanctuary is invaded—when justice, and humanity, and mercy are trampled on—when the flock is doomed to slaughter, and the dignity of the pontiffs either insulted or attempted to be seized by profane and sacrilegious hands, that religion displays itself in all its majesty. I have heard of a St. John Chrysostom denouncing with staff and crozier the sacrileges of the circus, and the unfeeling profligacy of the nobles of the imperial city. But you do not relish any ample references to those holy fathers. No matter; it may be well for your lordship and brother peers to get out of the murky medium of London, and breathe the purer atmosphere of those ancient times. I have heard of a St. Ambrose denounce, with staff and mitre, the master of the Roman world, the great Theodosius, for the murder of the citizens of Thessalonica, and forbid him to defile the sanctuary by his presence until he had atoned for his deeds of blood. I have heard of a St. Patrick, with staff and mitre, denounce the cruelties of Coro-

ticus, a British prince, who made an onslaught on his flock, and threaten the tyrant—pardon the uncourtly epithet, it is not mine—with the vengeance of Heaven. Nay, his zeal rose to an unusual height of indignation when he found this cruel tyrant aggravating his cruelty with insult, and treating the Irish (it seems the practice is not novel) as if they were not worthy to be treated like the Christians of Britain. You have just heard of a St. Hilary denouncing Constantius for his hypocritical attention to the bishops, with a view of sapping by fraud the faith which his predecessors could not subdue by violence. I have heard of a St. Leo, with mitre on head and staff in hand, checking the march of the chief of the Huns, and threatening him with the vengeance of Heaven should he not halt in his fiery career. We are told by that delightful writer, the author of the 'Mores Catholici,' who has collected, like a truly pious pilgrim, the fragrance of ancient times, whose works I should peculiarly recommend to the English aristocracy, and Irish too, that there was at Troyes, a tower representing in a piece of sculpture Loup, its sainted bishop, with mitre on head and staff in hand, staying the march of the same wrathful Attila. In fine, I have heard of St. Laurence, the Archbishop of Dublin, denouncing, like another John the Baptist, the adulterous connexion of Morochad, who, to protect himself in his crimes, allied himself with those alien robbers, who let loose a brood of exotic vices on the land; and, like the great and holy Pontiff, Gregory the Seventh, Laurence, because he loved justice, died in exile; yet, in all their denunciations, they wielded only their spiritual arms, and, like the Irish calumniated clergy, calming and soothing the spirits of their suffering flocks to resignation, whilst they failed not to denounce against crime the vengeance of the Almighty.

"You have insulted the majesty of Rome—Catholic Rome—when you laboured to tarnish the fame of one of the fairest, assuredly one of the most faithful, of the daughters of the Roman church, 'the mother and the mistress of all churches,' and added another poignant grief to the many others by which the Holy Father is bowed down, in attributing to the guilty connivance of the hierarchy of our country, those disorders which they labour incessantly to correct, and which, had you sufficient candour or moral courage to avow it, you should rather have traced to the uniform misgovernment of your own. You have represented this hierarchy 'as an accessory to crime—as a pestilent sore in the commonwealth.' And you have, as far as in you lay, accredited the misrepresentations that are hourly sent forth to the 'Eternal City' for the purpose of enslaving the Irish hierarchy."

The priests have held meetings all over the country, no less than four such appear as advertisements in the "Weekly Freeman" of the 22nd of January last. We quote the following examples:—

"At a meeting of the Deanery of Boyle, January 17th,

"Resolved—That our unbounded gratitude is eminently due to the

two great champions of the Irish Church, namely, our own revered Archbishop, and the excellent Bishop of Derry, who have so triumphantly vindicated the calumniated priesthood, thus making the cause of truth and justice shine even brighter than ever in the effulgence of their matchless eloquence; whilst, on the contrary, the *vile reptiles*, who attempted to stab in the dark, unprotected innocence, have cowardly skulked behind the hedge, not daring to confront in open day the defenders of that insulted body, whose reputation with fiendish malignity they strove to destroy.

"Resolved—That John O'Connell, the son and chosen successor of our great departed leader, has justly entitled himself to our confidence by a life of labour and honesty; and that he has covered himself with honour by the part he has so prudently and manfully taken during the last eventful session of parliament; himself and that little band of patriots, the forlorn hope of Ireland, surrounded as he was by a host of open foes, and, worse still, betrayed by *domestic* enemies; that we therefore consider it a duty to him, to ourselves, and to our helpless flocks, to sustain, as far as our poverty will permit, that bulwark of Ireland's rights and liberties, the Repeal Association, with the son of O'Connell at its head, to teach the people those holy lessons of peace, order, and sound morality, which have been always taught and practised by his illustrious father, the immortal architect of that association."

"At a meeting of the clergy of Killala, January 11th,

"Resolved—That the afore-mentioned hostile spirit of the English people towards the Irish priesthood is further evinced by the fact, that the reiterated denunciations poured forth at the last session in parliament against the inhuman oppression, the systematic tyranny, and the grinding injustice of the Irish landlords are passed over in silence, while certain members of parliament are reported slanderously to inveigh against the more temperate, and *certainly* the less inflammatory language of the priest, and try to avert attention from the real cause of the evil, by fastening the guilt on the shoulders of those who are now, as well as on every other similar occasion, the best conservators of the public peace.

"Resolved—That the result of the special commission now sitting, will prove, as the experience of ages hath already too clearly proved, that the relations between landlord and tenant are the never-failing sources of the miseries, as well as of the murders of Ireland; and that parliament, if it sincerely wishes to alleviate the former and prevent the latter, must devise some means by which the weal of the poor, as well as the rights of the rich, may be secured.

(Signed) ✠ Thomas Feeny, Chairman.
Patrick Malone, C.C., Secretary.

We could easily multiply such extracts to show that though the priests now deny that they encourage crime, yet they put forward very good reasons to show that they are not surprised at it:

"the people are oppressed; the relations of landlord and tenant are all wrong; let the legislature amend these before they try the assassins for murder." Now it is a fact, which few Englishmen believe, that every Roman Catholic is bound to obey his spiritual superior in all spiritual matters, and that every spiritual superior is to judge as to what is a spiritual matter. The pope, or the bishop, issues his order, and the inferior clergy convey it to their flocks. If they question it, they do so at the peril of their salvation; and the laity must obey under the same sanction. The religion, then, of the great body of the uneducated Irish consists in obedience to the dictates of the priest. "He who will not hear the Church is to be as a heathen;" in each parish the priest personifies the Church, and to disobey him is equal to the sin of apostasy or heathenism. The priests, therefore, hold the key to every man's conscience; they may blame the famine, or say that the false position of the tenants stimulates them to revenge; but it is nevertheless true, that if the hierarchy were to publish a circular, saying, that no murderer should receive the rites of the Church, that those who protect him should be excommunicated, agrarian outrages would cease at once.

Some years ago there was a great demand for scriptural instruction, there is still in many places the greatest desire for the Bible; but the spiritual guides have denounced the readers of the Scriptures, they have refused the rites of the Church to those who send their children to Protestant schools; in many places the priest orders the employer to dismiss a labourer who proves contumacious, and thus by a concerted system, by putting one man to be a spy upon another, and by holding fast the consciences of all, they can, in a great degree, frustrate the efforts of Protestants, and retain their flocks in spiritual bondage. If the same plan were adopted with regard to crime in the county Tipperary, it would, in a few years, be as peaceable as any part of England. There is, however, a good reason why the Bible and the landed interest should be equal objects of jealousy with the priests: their great object is power; few of them can ever accumulate wealth; if they do so, a considerable portion must always be left to the Church, and they have no families to provide for; a priest is a sort of abstraction, his personal identity is absorbed in his sacerdotal office. Power for their order is, therefore, what they most desire, and they are at this moment the strongest body in Ireland; but one obstacle remains between them and universal sway, and that barrier is the landed property. The occupancy of land, except in Ulster, is almost exclusively Roman Catholic; whatever, therefore, gives the occupier stronger rights than the proprietor, strengthens the power of the Church. This, whether

called by the name of tenant-right, fixity of tenure, or fair rents, is a matter of the deepest importance to M'Hale and his clergy. We have often felt surprised at the inconsistency of the Roman Catholic party. Popery and arbitrary power are naturally connected; and of all religious denominations they are the most absolute in enforcing their decrees. It is, therefore, a most anomalous position for the ministers of a tyrannical church to be found united with dissenters, infidels, and radicals; but we must recollect, that, before they assumed this position, they had first established their spiritual tyranny over their own subjects, they have organized them as an army ready to obey all orders; the tendency of the age is democratic, and where they expect to gain a victory they do not scruple to take advantage of the assistance of such allies as they can find, without inquiry whether they agree in principle or practice.

Liberty of conscience is a word easily used; but, the moment a Roman Catholic begins practically to apply it, the whole spiritual authority of Rome is brought to bear against him, the priest lays his curse upon him, and every neighbour becomes his enemy. With the great body of the population, therefore, under such obedience, we cannot wonder that the priests should cry out for democratic institutions; as long as the multitude obey them the voice of the people must be paramount; and the grand object of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland is, to place the people in subjection to the priests, and the institutions of the country in the hands of the people. The landlord, however, has still great power; his interests are so closely connected with those of his tenants, and he has so many opportunities of serving them, that while his property is large, his temporal influence must be in proportion to it. If any portion of his property can be diverted into another channel, or if he can be kept in fear of the people, the priest has gained so much in power. It is most remarkable, that, during the late struggle between the agricultural and manufacturing interest on the repeal of the Corn-laws, Ireland, an exclusively agricultural country, should have supported the party opposed to herself. Religion was here unquestioned, the only consideration for the farmer was, Shall I have a lower price for my grain if the protective duties be removed? and thousands of Irish farmers felt this. The priests, however, thought otherwise, they looked to the repeal of the Corn-laws as a blow to the antagonist power, and they therefore told the people they must vote for their abolition. "Shout for cheap bread," said Mr. O'Connell; and the farmers took up the cry, and voted for the reduction of their own produce. In this matter, the present Pope seems to have taken a lesson from Dr. M'Hale and his party, he

has encouraged democracy in politics, but he is still absolute in religion, expecting to subdue the nobility through the blind devotion of the people. We think they are both mistaken, and that ultimately they will frustrate their own ends.

While the Roman Catholic Church continues to hold a nation under spiritual bondage, they must, of course, be the most powerful body in the world; but when the people are taught their own strength, they sometimes rebel against their spiritual guides, and, becoming tired of blind subjection, they endeavour to strike out a course for themselves. This brings us to the second party of repealers, who are commonly called Young Ireland. This is a much less numerous, worse organized, and less dangerous body than the former, they are simply radicals, led by a few interested men, who stimulate their passions and flatter their weakness, either to obtain seats in Parliament, or to circulate a newspaper. While the Old Ireland party have an agent in every parish, educated and sworn to obey orders, while he is supposed to hold absolute power over the salvation of every individual in his flock, and can therefore guide them as he will, the party called Young Ireland are endeavouring to get up a sort of democratic organization in party clubs, repeal reading-rooms, national schools, and patriotic speeches. The great organ of this party is the "Nation" newspaper, their leader in Parliament, Mr. Smith O'Brien. To these representatives we therefore look for the expression of public opinion as entertained by the second body of the Irish repealers.

Mr. O'Brien voted against the coercion bill, for so far showing his opinion on the lawfulness and expediency of unrestrained murder; but the "Nation" is perhaps a better index of the peculiar feelings of this party; we turn to the last number for the year 1847, and we find there, what we never knew before, that there are now a great number of *confederate clubs* in Ireland. Besides five or six in Dublin, there is the Sarsfield Club in Limerick, at which "Dr. Daniel Griffin delivered a very able and interesting lecture." There is the Desmond Club at Cork, at which resolutions were passed to the effect "that England was determined to extend nothing to Ireland but brute force and violence," (they forget last year's alms,) "and that her measures have been characterized by rancorous hostility and contemptuous indifference." The President of the Davis Club, about the same time, lectured on the growth and decay of Irish trade. The same newspaper tells us of the confederates of Ardfert, in the county of Kerry, who met, "not to oppose the Conciliation Hall, but to obtain just rights, and to resolve that these rights, this Parliament, and the green flag, can be best restored by the measures adopted by the Irish confederation." These confederates have

also (as the "Nation" tells us) extended their clubs to England; we have the Brian Boru Club at Southampton, and the O'Connell Club in London, at both of which sundry extracts from the "Nation" were read. These meetings, of course, tend to keep up discontent, and to circulate the "Nation." This party is strictly republican, they are anxious to throw off British control, and, as far as they dare avow it in the present state of Ireland, they are equally jealous of the tyranny of the priests: their policy for the present is to praise them, and to make common cause with them against England, but, if they had the power, they would soon show that democratic infidelity is as impatient of spiritual despotism as of political control. The whole strength of this party consists in words, "Liberty," "National independence," "Dulce et decorum est pro patriâ mori." They have a vast desire after great names, and constantly attempt to attach importance to some thing or some body about whom no body hears, or no body cares. They remind us of Martin Chuzzlewit's friends in America, "Have you seen our Elijah Pogram?" "What's that?" "Have you never heard of the Pogram defiance?" "How little the Britishers can appreciate our institutions!" Elijah Pogram turns out to be a flaming patriot who is on board the steam-boat, who has abused the gentry, hates England, advocates repudiation and slavery, upholds free institutions, chews extensively, and bullies his fellow passengers. The "Nation" and its party remind us also of the ancient idolaters; the heathen seem to have had something left of the organ of veneration, but as they repudiated the legitimate worship of the true God, they sought out other objects of respect, and bowed down to stocks and stones, the work of their own hands. Thus the "Nation," like all ultra-republicans, reject the legitimate honour due to the king and his representatives, they scorn to submit to lawful authority, but at the same time they exalt some silly or self-interested demagogue as the god of their idolatry.

The praises of "Davis," once one of their contributors, who wrote rebellious songs, and advocated physical force, "the examples of "Dathy, and Columbanus, and Brian, and Wolfe Tone," whom the editor professes to emulate, are all sounded forth in their articles. As the three former of these worthies belong to the period when good king Arthur ruled England from his round table, we do not exactly know how we are to follow their example, but the history of the last is a melancholy one; he led a French invasion into Ireland in the year '98, he was taken prisoner, and anticipated a traitor's death, by suicide, at the age of six-and-thirty. Of course he is an example for Irish patriots. So great an evil is English power in Ireland, that the invasion of a foreign

enemy would be a light misfortune in comparison: the weakness of England's defences, the probability of a French army landing in Ireland, are all discussed with a coolness which leads us almost to question the sanity of the writers; and they are continually propounding the doctrine, that "England's weakness is Ireland's opportunity." Those who know any thing of the horrors of war, the country desolated, the people leaving all their property and escaping for their lives, the number of innocent men slain or wounded in battle, and the vast amount of physical suffering entailed upon the seat of war, must look with horror upon the calm and dignified hopes expressed by Irish patriots, that a French army may yet rescue Ireland from the hands of its imaginary oppressors. Our readers will find the subject treated with a great deal of humorous truth, in a book published last year, "the Falcon Family." The author has seen clearly the absurdity of Young Ireland, the shadows for which they are ready to fight, and the folly with which they pursue them. Imaginary grievances, the absurd attempt to attach importance to fabulous characters, and the vast desire for self-exaltation, which is the real object of the party, are all well depicted. If it were not that we occasionally see a number of the "Nation," we should have thought that the folly had passed away with the monster meetings and state trials of 1843 and 1844.

Public opinion, however, in Ireland does not stop here; as Young Ireland split from O'Connell, on the grounds that it was hardly fair that one man should have all the talk and all the tribute to himself, and that the priests possessed too much power, so now a younger party, whom we may call Old Ireland's grandchild, is now making its appearance. The beginning of sin is as when one letteth out water, when the barrier is broken the torrent soon forces its own way; so, while the "Nation" was going a step further than O'Connell, some of the "Nation's" disciples consider that they are not going far enough, and naturally desire to set up in the sedition line on their own account, and on thorough-going principles. Mr. O'Connell depends upon the priests; Mr. Duffy of the "Nation" on some of the landlords and some of the middle class; but Mr. Mitchell, late an editor of the "Nation," cannot agree with either, so he is determined to have an organ of his own. We extract a portion of his letter to the editor of the "Nation," explaining his reasons for leaving that publication. It is dated January 7, 1848.

"I desired to say all this to the people plainly. I desired to point out to them that this infamous bill, falsely entitled 'for the prevention of crime,' was merely an engine to crush tenant-right, and all other

popular right, and to enable the landlords to eject, distrain, and exterminate in peace and security. I desired to preach to them, that every farmer in Ireland has a right to his land in perpetuity (let 'law' say as it will);—that no landlord who denies that right ought to receive any rent;—that tenant-right, however, though the universal right of all Irish farmers, never had been, and never would be recognized or secured by English law—that there was and will be no other way of establishing and securing that right, except, as in Ulster, by successful intimidation, that is to say, by the determined public opinion of armed men:—that, therefore, the power calling itself a 'government' which called upon the people of Ireland to deliver up their arms under any pretext, must be the mortal enemy of that people, their rights, their liberties, and their lives. I desired to warn my countrymen accordingly, that if they should carry their guns to the police stations when ordered by Lord Clarendon, they would be putting weapons into the hands of their deadly foes, and committing virtual suicide. I desired to preach to them that the country is actually in a state of war—a war of 'property' against poverty—a war of 'law' against life; and that their safety lay, not in trusting to any laws or legislation of the enemies' parliament, but solely in their determination to stand upon their own individual rights, defend those to the last, and sell their lives and lands as dear as they could.

* * * * *

"Therefore I desired that the nation and the confederation should rather employ themselves in promulgating sound instruction upon military affairs—upon the natural lines of defence which make the island so strong, and the method of making those available—upon the construction and defence of field-works, and especially upon the use of proper arms—not with a view to any immediate insurrection, but in order that the stupid 'legal and constitutional' shouting, voting, and 'agitating' that have made our country an abomination to the whole earth, should be changed *into a deliberate study of the theory and practice of guerilla warfare;* and that the true and only method of regenerating Ireland might in course of time recommend itself to a nation so long abused and deluded by 'legal' humbug."

This letter was followed shortly after by the following prospectus of a new paper. This it would be a pity to mutilate, so we give it entire.

"On Saturday, the 12th day of February, will be published the first number of a Dublin Weekly Journal, entitled 'The United Irishman,' edited by John Mitchell, aided by Thomas Devin Reilly, John Martin of Loughorn, and other competent contributors.

"'Our independence must be had at all hazards. If the men of property will not support us, they must fall: we can support ourselves by the aid of that numerous and respectable class of the community, the men of no property.'—*Theobald Wolfe Tone.*

"The projectors of 'The United Irishman' believe that the world is weary of Old Ireland and also of Young Ireland—that the day for both these noisy factions is past and gone—that Old and Young alike have grown superannuated and obsolete together.

"They believe that the public ear is thirsting to hear some voice bolder, more intelligible, more independent of parties, policies, and cliques, than any it has heard for a long while.

"They believe that Ireland really and truly wants to be freed from English dominion.

"They know not how many or how few will listen to their voice. They have no party prepared to halloo at their backs; and have no trust, save in the power of truth, and the immortal beauty of freedom. He that hath ears to hear, let him ear.

"The principles on which 'The United Irishman' will be conducted are shortly these:—

"1st. That the Irish people have a just and indefeasible right to this island, and to all the moral and material wealth and resources thereof, to possess and govern the same for their own use, maintenance, comfort, and honour, as a distinct sovereign state.

"2nd. That it is in their power, and it is also their manifest duty to make good and exercise that right.

"3rd. That the life of one peasant is as precious as the life of one nobleman or gentleman.

"4th. That the property of the farmers and labourers of Ireland is as sacred as the property of all the noblemen and gentlemen in Ireland, and is also immeasurably more valuable.

"5th. That the custom called tenant-right, which prevails partially in the north of Ireland, is a just and salutary custom both for north and south; that it ought to be extended and secured in Ulster, and adopted and enforced, by common consent, in the other three provinces of the island.

"6th. That every man in Ireland who shall hereafter pay taxes for the support of the state, shall have a just right to an equal voice with every other man in the government of that state, and the outlay of those taxes.

"7th. That no Irishman at present has any 'legal' rights, or claim to the protection of any law; and that all 'legal and constitutional agitation' in Ireland is a delusion.

"8th. That every free man, and every man who desires to become free, ought to have arms, and to practise the use of them.

"9th. That no 'combination of classes' in Ireland is desirable, just, or possible, save on the terms of the rights of the industrious classes being acknowledged and secured.

"10th. That no good thing can come from the English parliament, or the English government.

"To enforce and apply these principles—to make Irishmen thoroughly understand them, lay them up in their hearts, and practise

them in their lives—will be the sole and constant study of the conductors of 'The United Irishman.'

"For the rest, 'The United Irishman' will be regularly supplied with historical and literary articles, and reviews of all books published in Ireland, or specially relating to Ireland. As a newspaper, it will be carefully selected and compiled, so as to present its readers with a complete summary of each week's news.

"Subscription (payable in advance)

Yearly	£1	1	0
Half Yearly	0	10	6
Quarterly	0	5	3
Single Paper	0	0	5

Office, 12, Trinity-street, Dublin.

"Agents for all the towns in Ireland wanted."

This is bold and plain speaking, but, like Dr. M'Hale's letters, it tells the truth, and honest men should be much obliged to them both. There are at this moment many thousands, we might say a million or two, who coincide with these sentiments. A respectable farmer, in a peaceable district, in commenting on the late murders, coolly said, "When a few hundred more are shot we shall have tenant-right;" and this feeling among the peasantry is very general. The priests, agitators, and newspapers have taught them that they are the finest and the most oppressed peasantry in the world, and they are naturally eager to rid themselves of their tyrants. They believe that they have a right to carry arms, and to practise the use of them; and, if this has any meaning, it is, that shooting an oppressor is a justifiable action. Thus we see that public opinion among the repealers, divides itself into three classes,—the supporters of the usurped authority of the priests, the advocates of democracy, and the preachers of guerilla warfare and open revolution.

As yet, however, Ireland is controlled by the stronger force of public opinion in England; when murder is practised in the open day-light, and approved by the inhabitants of a district, that district must be re-conquered, and, if one prime-minister is not strong enough to do it, another must be found to take his place. For many years Whig ministries in England were blind to the real state of Ireland. The tithe agitation of 1832, and the murders of the clergy which followed it, were winked at or passed by as easily as the law would allow. Roman Catholic magistrates, many of them noted agitators, were appointed in order to have the confidence of the people, and they were ready with plausible excuses for every act of violence.

When Lord Normanby was Lord-Lieutenant, he forbid the crown lawyers to challenge jurors at the assizes; and he allowed the juries to be selected from the lower class of farmers. A prisoner, therefore, by challenging as many as the law allows, could go through the panel until he got a friend or accomplice on the jury, and he could then be sure there would be no conviction. In some instances, the sub-sheriffs were accused of being parties to these arrangements, but in all cases it was evident that a paternal government had no desire to convict. When, as rarely happened, a criminal was convicted, the crown either ordered a light sentence, or Lord Normanby pardoned him altogether at the recommendation of the priests.

So the reign of Lord Normanby was a sort of jubilee to all the ill-disposed in Ireland, and Mr. O'Connell gave the government his support in return for the impunity which they conferred on his followers. The Irish evidently expected a renewal of the same terms of peace on the accession of Lord John Russell to office; and the foolish declaration of Mr. Labouchere, that "every Irishman now possesses the right to carry arms for lawful purposes," only confirmed their expectations. Public opinion in England has in this instance grievously disappointed them; Lord Clarendon really understands the state of the country, and is determined to enforce the law: the law officers of the crown have got a strong hint that they must do their duty efficiently, and the special commission has returned from the trials at Limerick, Clare, and Tipperary. By a short summary of the facts elicited on the trials, our readers will be able to appreciate the fruits of Irish agitation, and the teaching of the priests; they will also see what the people are for whom Mr. John O'Connell claims the right of self-government, and for whom Mr. Mitchell asserts the right to carry arms and practise their use.

The first case brought up for trial at Limerick was that of the murder of John Kelly, of Knocksantry, a farmer of the lower class, on the 22nd of July, 1847. It appeared in evidence, that William Ryan, commonly called Puck, or Ryan Puck (the Irish give very expressive nicknames), entered Kelly's house in the evening, while he was sitting at the fire with his nephew, a boy of twelve years old, beside him, and his wife, and other inmates of the family, in the kitchen along with him: Ryan came close up to him, so that all persons present could distinguish his features, and fired a blunderbuss loaded with eleven bullets into Kelly's body; one of these passed through Kelly and wounded his nephew in the leg. Ryan was well known to several inmates of the family, and was not disguised. As the quarrel arose about dispossessing a tenant, he plainly calculated on the power of the Ribbon system

of intimidation, and that none of the witnesses could be prevailed on to swear against him. Several of these, whose evidence on the trial was stronger than before the magistrates, declared that when first called upon they were afraid to speak the truth. Ryan was afterwards taken in the house of John Frewen; he was concealed on the top of a bed, and had his blunderbuss again loaded with eleven bullets in his hand, and had it not been for the determined conduct of the sub-inspector, he would probably have shot some of the police who came to arrest him. He was sentenced to be hanged; and Frewen, who concealed him, is to be transported for life, as an accessary after the fact. William Ryan was engaged in another murder in the county of Clare, as appeared on the trial of his brother, Patrick Ryan, at Ennis. It also appeared, that, five days before the murder of John Kelly, he had attempted to murder his brother, Michael Kelly. He was evidently a most determined ruffian, and ready to murder any one for hire, though only about twenty years of age.

The next trial was of Andrew Dea, aged 17, for the murder of Edmond Murphy, on the 9th of June, 1847. It appeared that the father of the prisoner had been ejected from some land by the Court of Chancery, about the end of last May; and that his successor was a man named Noonan. A few days after, Andrew Dea and his brother Patrick went towards Noonan's house armed with pistols, and met Noonan and his brother-in-law, Edmond Murphy, on the road. Patrick presented his pistol at Noonan, and it missed fire; for this he was transported at the last assizes; at the same time Andrew Dea fired at Murphy, and shot him dead.

The third capital conviction was in the case of Thomas Renahan, aged 21, for the murder of John M'Enery, on the 3rd of October, 1847. The prisoner was one of a gang who were engaged in robbing for arms; they had obtained what fire-arms were in the house, and they then dragged the unfortunate man from under a bed where he had concealed himself, and beat him so severely that he died the following day. The reason assigned for this barbarous murder was, that the prisoner, who held thirty acres of land, had impounded some cattle belonging to M'Enery, that a quarrel had ensued, and that M'Enery had prosecuted him at the petty-sessions for an assault on a young man in his employment; while in the act of beating him to death, Renahan used the expression, "Remember the last court-day."

When the judges returned to Limerick, after holding the court at Ennis, James Skehan was brought in guilty of the murder of Mr. Ralph Hill, on the 18th of November, 1847. The prisoner in this case was servant to John Quan, a farmer,

whose haggard had been distrained for rent, and, from a difficulty in finding purchasers, Mr. Hill, a land-agent, had brought a number of persons in his own employment to bid for the corn, which they bought the day before the murder. While they were engaged in removing it, the prisoner concealed himself behind a ditch, and fired two shots at the party from a double-barrelled gun; both shots took effect; Mr. Hill died instantly of his wound, and one of his men, named M'Mahon, was wounded, but escaped. Immediately after, a third shot was fired from the same place, and a man, named Tobyn, severely wounded. The bailiffs then retreated, leaving Mr. Hill's body and Tobyn behind them, until they could procure assistance. A little boy of nine years old proved that he saw Skehan making bullets, and that several persons had spoken of the murder the day before: on that occasion the prisoner had said, "it is a murder not to kill Hill;" and John Quan, the master of the farm, assented. Quan was afterwards put on his trial, and convicted of aiding and abetting in the murder; he had openly declared his intention of resisting the removal of the corn; he had advised the carmen to keep out of the way, or they would be sorry, and he was standing close by when the shots were fired. Both these men were left for execution.

The next case is one of peculiar atrocity, giving us an idea of fierce determination and murderous revenge, for which we were altogether unprepared, even in Limerick. It appears that in the month of November, 1846, a man named Philip Hourigan had been attacked and beaten so severely as to endanger his life: he had convicted four of the assailants at the subsequent assizes; ever since he had lived in perpetual apprehension of being murdered, and, having made known his fears to the authorities, he had been allowed to have a guard of two or three policemen to sleep in his house. According to the "Times' Commissioner," it is no uncommon sight in Tipperary to see a workman ploughing, or a tradesman following his business, attended by two Government officers dressed in uniform, and supported by the country—nothing less will give the poor man security for his life. The guard, however, were in the habit of retiring for an hour or two in the morning to get their breakfast, and the ruffians, taking advantage of this unguarded hour, entered Hourigan's house about seven o'clock in the morning of the 6th of April, 1847. Hourigan was at a little distance, and, seeing that the party were armed, and had their faces blackened, he first concealed himself, and then went to call for assistance. Disappointed of their intended victim, the murderers determined to have their revenge; they found the wife and daughter of Hourigan sitting by the fire, and his son, a lad of seventeen years of age, in bed, in fever. They deli-

berately shot the woman in presence of her daughter, and then struck her on her head with their guns till she fell into the fire, and died in a few minutes: they then proceeded to the bed-room, where Cornelius Hourigan was ill; one of them lifted him up, and set him against the wall as a mark, and another deliberately shot him dead. The party then proceeded leisurely through the country; they were seen by several persons, and easily described to the police. For this deed, one man, named Michael Howard, was hanged at the last assizes, and another of the same name is now under sentence of death.

The trials at Ennis are somewhat to the same effect; the first case was the murder of Mr. James Watson, agent to Mr. Arthur. It appears that Mr. Watson had distrained a farmer, named John Crowe, about the beginning of May, 1847. It was proved that shortly afterwards, William Ryan (Puck), who was sentenced at Limerick, Patrick Ryan (Small), and James Hayes, were brought to Crowe's house; that he used threatening language regarding Mr. Watson, and prevailed on these three men to undertake the murder for a sum of money. Patrick Ryan received 5*l*. They met Mr. Watson on the 17th of May last, in the middle of the day, as he was riding on a road where it was known he must pass. They fired at him, and he fell; they then attacked him with their guns, the stock of one was found broken, and Mr. Watson died in four days of the injuries he had received. This murder was committed within a few yards of a national school, several of the most important witnesses were pupils, and it does not appear that the murderers took any means of concealing themselves; they seem to have trusted to public opinion, or Captain Rock's reign of terror, as their safeguard. For this offence the two men who committed the murder, and John Crowe who paid them for it, are sentenced to be hanged.

After the murderers of Mr. Watson, the next important trial was that of Michael Butler and William Hourigan, both about forty years of age, for the murder of William Cleary, a man in very humble life, on the 6th of November last. The deceased had prosecuted some persons for an outrage at the Spring assizes, and the prisoners shot him for revenge, as he was on his way home from the village of Broadford; Cleary lived till the 21st of the month, and the prisoners were convicted on his dying declaration, supported by the testimony of persons who saw them on the road. The Chief Baron passed sentence of death on both the prisoners.

Thomas M'Enerney was next convicted of the murder of Martin M'Mahon, which took place while the prisoner was attacking a dwelling-house, on the 3rd of January, 1848, the day

before the Special Commission opened at Limerick. As it appeared to the court that there was no premeditated intention of murder, as the guns were not loaded, the prisoner and his associates (the latter pleaded guilty) will be transported. Michael M'Mahon was also convicted of a conspiracy to murder Mr. Matthew Bolland. The chief evidence against him was Michael Hawkins, who proved that the prisoner had asked him to collect money, as 9*l.* would be sufficient to have Mr. Bolland shot. The reason assigned was, that Mr. Bolland had prevented the labourers on the public works from getting their diet; also, that Mr. Bolland held a good many farms, and if he were out of the way, some poor man would get them. Another witness proved that the prisoner had offered him 5*l.* to shoot Bolland. Another, that he had asked him to subscribe, because if his (witness's) land were vacant, Bolland would take it. It seems that one of the witnesses would have joined in the conspiracy, but he grew frightened, and consulted his priest, who dissuaded him from it. The fact of consulting a spiritual guide on such a subject, shows rather an extraordinary state of society, and, at least, argues that the witness did not feel quite sure of the view which the Church might take of the morality of the case, or the expediency of the act. As Mr. Bolland, however, appeared as a witness, and had received no hurt, the prisoner will only be transported. Sentence of death was recorded in these two cases.

England has heard much of the murder of landlords, and certainly many of them have lost their lives; but let us recollect that all the foregoing cases, except two, were men in the humble walks of life. Mr. Watson was a land-agent, and Mr. Hill seems to have been an under-agent; but, with these exceptions, the murdered men were all in the rank of small farmers or labourers. Let this be a lesson to the agitators and demagogues who so powerfully uphold the rights of "the men of no property." If Englishmen read of such events, they often pass them over as matters of little consequence; it is only the murder of a gentleman's steward, or a bailiff, shot while distraining. When, however, a gentleman, or one whose name is in some degree known, falls a victim to the Irish agrarian law, a greater sensation is created; among these we may number Major Mahon, the Rev. Mr. Lloyd, and Mr. Hassard, in the north; and the late Mr. William Roe in the south. Mr. Roe was a gentleman of small but independent fortune, he had been called to the bar, and generally resided near Dublin, but used to spend a portion of every year on his property, at his mother's house, Rockwell, in the county Tipperary. He was son-in-law of the late Mr. Patrick Clarke, who was murdered about four years ago in the same

county: this murder was committed (as our readers may recollect) in the field with six or eight of his own labourers, who never left their work, or attempted to assist their master, or pursue the assassins. In the month of August last, Mr. Roe had ejected a family who had not paid rent for some years: Mr. Roe had said some time before, that Lonergan's family were likely to give him trouble, but that he was not afraid, as he understood the management of the country so well. However, on the 2nd of last October, as he was passing through his property at Boytonrath, John Lonergan, one of the family who had been ejected, waited for him behind a hedge, he fired at the distance of about six or seven yards, eleven large swan-drops entered Mr. Roe's head and the back of his neck, and he died instantaneously. Lonergan had been heard to say, that "there were some black birds in the country, and it would be a mercy to shoot some of them." He had also been seen to watch Mr. Roe for several days. When the deed was done, he coolly returned to his house, and said Mr. Roe had shot himself. This is the approved formula in Ireland whenever an outrage is committed, "Oh, the villain, sure he did it himself!" and lately a bench of magistrates were convinced that a complainant, who was frightfully mutilated, had actually cut off his own ears! It was proved on the trial, that Mr. Roe's gun-cane was found charged, and the shot entered his back. A little girl, whose evidence was wrung from her with great difficulty, told the magistrates that her aunt, the wife of Lonergan, had said, on hearing the shot, "Come in, Mary, for Johnny has just shot Mr. Roe." This same woman, since her husband's conviction, has said, "he did a good job any way;" and his brother has remarked, that "many a better man has been hanged." The police discovered a paper on the scene of the murder, which was torn from a copy-book in Lonergan's house, and he was seen near his place of concealment by numbers of people. The jury found him guilty, and sentence of death has been passed on him. From the publicity of the place, close to a number of houses, it is quite evident that Lonergan, like most of the perpetrators of agrarian outrages, calculated on the state of public opinion in his favour, and that either the witnesses would not come forward, or the jury would not convict him. Lonergan left home until Christmas-day, he then supposed the matter was forgotten, but was taken by the police. This was the first trial at Clonmel.

Two brothers, named Philip and Henry Cody, were next convicted of the murder of Edward Madden, an under-steward to Lord Ormond, on the 9th of July, 1847. It appears that the deceased was assisting John Kelly, a steward or overseer of work-

men. John Kelly stated, that Lord Ormond had 166 persons at work that week in a wood; they were employed in felling trees, stripping bark, and removing brush-wood. That at about half-past five o'clock in the morning he was proceeding to the wood to call over the men, when he heard a shot, and heard Madden cry out; he then saw a man come from behind a heap of brush-wood, and fire a second shot; another man then fired a third shot at Madden, while he was endeavouring to reach a gap in the ditch. Neither Kelly, nor any of the men who were with him, attempted to pursue the murderers, the reason which he assigns is, that he thought they would have been out of sight before he could reach them. All this took place about half-past five o'clock, and before six; more than a hundred people were at their work. Many of these, who were assembling from all parts of the country, must have heard the shots, and met the murderers, as they were making their escape—as no one, except the men who fired, was going *from* the wood. Henry Cody did not appear that day; but Philip came at one o'clock, and earned half-a-day's wages. All this transaction shows a coolness and disregard for human life which we can scarcely realize in England. An overseer sees his assistant killed within a few hundred yards of him; he sees two shots, and hears a third fired at him; yet he takes no means of ascertaining who are the murderers, but goes quietly to his work within half-an-hour, and sets his labourers to their business as if nothing had happened. We suppose the deceased had had some dispute with the workmen as to their wages, or the quantity of their work; he could not have been much above the rank of a labourer, as he could not write, and his dying deposition, which identified the prisoners, was signed with a mark. Here, as in Mr. Roe's case, it is quite evident that the murderers rightly calculated on the assistance or connivance of the whole body of the labourers; that the hundred men who were at work at six o'clock, or a large proportion of them, are accessaries to the crime, and morally guilty of murder; and that even the steward, who ought naturally, from personal motives, to have assisted the sufferer, or pursued the murderers, was afraid to stir in the business, and seemed to consider the whole transaction as a matter of course.

Terence Corboy, the murderer of Patrick Gleeson, seems to have committed his crime with the same cool expectation of impunity. Gleeson was a process-server, and employed to serve notices on defaulters in rent; on the 17th of October, 1846, he attempted to serve notices of ejectment on the lands of Gurtnafauna between the hours of eight and nine in the morning; he was pursued by a crowd consisting of three or four men, and the rest women and children, who, according to one of the witnesses,

"were shouting him off the road." He was inquiring for the house of John Commins, when the prisoner came up and said, "You have had your life long enough," and then fired the contents of a blunderbuss into his body. Though wounded, Patrick Gleeson did not fall immediately; but the prisoner, in the view of several witnesses, and close to the crowd above mentioned, came up, and first knocked him down with his blunderbuss, and then struck him on the head till his skull was fractured. The unfortunate man lived for five days, but his evidence was inadmissible, as his medical attendant could not prove that he had seen him in his senses; he was described as shot through the liver, and his skull smashed in. Conscience, however, in the case of Terence Corboy was not entirely asleep; he fled to Wales, and being overtaken in a storm, he confessed to one of his companions that he had been engaged in a murder; he said also that he had received 5*l.* 16*s.* which was subscribed to pay him for his deed. This instance affords us another melancholy proof that the agrarian outrages of Ireland are not the work of one disappointed tenant, or one desperate villain rendered reckless of life by ill-treatment, (as some of the newspapers would lead us to believe,) but they are the natural effect of a regularly organized system, and that the whole district participates in the guilt of the perpetrator by assisting, rewarding, and concealing him.

The attempt to murder Mr. Baillie is the last of the capital crimes, and with it we shall conclude our detail of the Special Commission; like the murder of Mr. Roe it is still fresh in the recollection of our readers. Mr. Baillie and his brother-in-law, Mr. Head, were returning from Nenagh in a gig, about five o'clock in the evening of the 13th of November, 1847. It appeared that John Daly (who has been convicted) had been arrested for the sum of 70*l.* due to a Mr. Rowley, for whom Mr. Baillie was agent. It was shown, on the testimony of two approvers, Garrigan and Dwyer, that Daly, with men named Carty, Rowan, and Connors, had spoken to them of the murder, that some of the party had offered the price of a suit of clothes to one of the approvers to shoot Mr. Baillie. Here are six men at least implicated in the conspiracy. Daly, it seems, not being able to find a deputy, undertook the business himself. In company with two or three others, he waylaid Mr. Baillie, and shot him as he was passing by. One of the bullets struck Mr. Head's hat, and for several weeks Mr. Baillie's life was in the greatest danger; his jaw was broken, and his face shockingly disfigured; and he was unable to appear at the trial. There is one feature in this case of peculiar enormity, which we have not seen in the public prints, but which has been given us on unquestionable authority. The shot was fired close to the house of a tenant or dependent of

Mr. Baillie, who had received several marks of kindness from him; among other trifling attentions, some of the ladies of his family had lately given them a present of some delft and other articles of furniture, which Mr. Head recognized on entering the cabin, and supposed he was among friends; he carried the wounded man into the house and laid him on the bed, but not a single individual of the family would go for a surgeon. All his threats and entreaties were ineffectual, he was obliged to leave his dying brother among his enemies, and proceed two miles back to Nenagh himself; passive resistance was the order of the day, and Mr. Baillie had been shot by the combined people of Ireland. In Mr. Head's absence, the violent thirst, which often follows the inflammation of a gun-shot wound, had set in, and Mr. Baillie entreated the woman of the house to bring him a glass of water; though several women were present they all refused, and the wounded man, apparently dying, being unable to stand upright, was obliged to crawl on his hands and feet along the ground, in the darkness of a winter's night, to a ditch in the neighbourhood of the cabin, and drink the dirty water out of his own hand! Let Ireland boast of her kind-hearted peasantry after this; the barbarity of such conduct is we believe unparalleled in the annals of human ferocity, but it is only a part of the frightful system where men and women are inured to the perpetration of crime, and taught to consider themselves bound to oppose a common enemy. The light that is in them is darkness, and how great is that darkness! We cannot forget that on this latter trial, Nicholas Garrigan, the approver, declared that, being a friend and relation of Daly, he was quite ready to shoot any one whom Daly should point out to him; and when the counsel for the prisoner asked if he would have murdered him at Daly's desire, he replied that he certainly would. Daly is now under sentence of death, and Rowan, who was acquitted of the murder, will be tried at the next assizes for a conspiracy [1].

The production of such hardened villains as Garrigan, as crown witnesses, has been much canvassed, and some have found fault with the crown prosecutors for using them at all. We think, that, like Lord Clarendon's other acts, it has been one displaying sound judgment; combination is the great evil, and nothing so effectually tends to break up combination as distrust of each other and the treachery of accomplices. The Chief Justice put this strongly forward, showing the people that the moment detection was expected, there was a sort of competition among the guilty which

[1] The result of the Special Commission is as follows:—To be hanged, 16; to be transported for life, 10; for less periods, 19; to be imprisoned for various periods, 36. This return does not include those sentenced to imprisonment or transportation at Clonmel.

should first turn informer, and escape his share of the punishment by betraying his friends. We would therefore severely punish all accessaries, and reward the traitors, not for their own sake, but for the interests of society at large. Hundreds must have been aware of the truth in several of the murders which we have narrated; the hope of a reward, and the fear of punishment, would soon stimulate some of these to give information, and, above all, it would infuse suspicion into the minds of those about to commit a crime, so that they would no longer calculate on an accomplice and supporter in every man they might chance to meet.

The Commission closed on the 2nd of February, and the sixteen criminals above mentioned were left under sentence of death. The cry of "saints and martyrs" has not been raised by the priests, as was done in the case of Brian Seery, who a few years ago was hanged for the attempt to murder Sir Francis Hopkins. Public opinion was rather too strong for this move, or we should doubtless have heard of it again. "Sainted Seery," and "martyred Seery" were repeated, till England almost believed that the man was not really guilty. The public opinion, however, of the party, which wishes to see the murderers escape, has found means to give vent to itself in another way. A public meeting was called in Dublin, on the 3rd of February, for the purpose of petitioning the Lord-Lieutenant to commute the sentences; and though, when the meeting assembled, the speakers did not think it advisable to ask for a reprieve in the present cases, yet they have petitioned parliament to abolish the punishment of death: they state that capital punishment is an interference with the prerogative of God, repugnant to the duties of a Christian state, and does not tend to the suppression of crime. There were of course resolutions observing "that murder is not justifiable;" such a salvo is quite necessary, but the real object evidently is that the people may feel that their leaders sympathize with them, and that they are quite ready to enter their protest against the penalty which God denounces upon him that sheddeth man's blood. Let us remember that the Lord Mayor of Dublin, who took the chair at the meeting, represents the feelings of the radical corporation, that he sits in the civic chair, first occupied since corporate reform by Daniel O'Connell himself, and that, besides a few priests and quakers, (who always seem to study a sort of false philanthropy,) the chief speaker was Mr. John Reynolds, the new Repeal member for the city of Dublin. This gives us a fair index of public opinion, that a large proportion of the corporators and electors of the second city in the British dominions are desirous, if they dare say so, that sixteen open assassins should not receive the due reward of their deeds. The Roman Catholic priesthood always avoid taking part

in a trial where a capital conviction may follow: this is a rule of their church, which they are ready to admit. A few years ago, from the disturbed state of the country, a difficulty arose in conveying the mail-bags to a remote village in the county of Kerry. One of the hostlers, a Protestant, who knew the country well, volunteered to carry the letters, but was attacked by a large crowd, and murdered on the road. The parish priest was riding by at the time, and either could not or would not interfere to save him. He was, however, as it was well known, perfectly cognizant of the facts, and could have given the best evidence. The post-office prosecuted for the murder, as well as the crown, and their lawyer (who is now a judge) called upon the crown prosecutor to insist upon the priest being produced as a witness: as Lord Normanby was in office at the time, this suggestion was refused, and the prisoners escaped for want of evidence. Here is another instance in which the laws of Rome are at variance with the laws of England, and another means by which the system now dominant in Ireland contrives to screen the guilty, and to leave the innocent at their mercy.

From these facts we have arrived at the following conclusions as to the state of religion and politics in Ireland.

1. That universal dominion over soul and body, conscience and property, is the object of the "Catholic Hierarchy;" that nothing else will satisfy them; and that all further concessions, short of giving them their desires, are worse than useless.

2. That, holding the vast powers which they have, the priests as a body are morally responsible for an overwhelming proportion of the evil now at work in the country; that they have the power to restrain the violence of the people, while they claim and exercise the right to increase it; that they hate the landed interest, and are continually opposing it by their writings, speeches, and denunciations from the altar; that their organization, and the fears of the ignorant, have for a while enabled them to defy the law, but that England is now beginning to see the question in its proper light, and to lay the blame where it is most deserved.

3. That, so far from possessing a power of self-government, Ireland is at this moment in a state of national insanity; that public opinion among the multitude and their leaders is so far perverted, as to have lost the natural distinctions of right and wrong; that, containing in herself a controlling power which claims authority above law, and can persuade men at any moment to act contrary to their plain temporal interests, she must be treated as a lunatic by her more sober and more powerful neighbours; that if the authority exercised by the priests were not enough to convince us of this, the absurd ravings of the Young Ireland press would lead us to the same conclusion.

4. That there is no use in talking of constitutional rights to men who declare their determination to set authority at defiance, and combine, by districts and counties, to support their claim to the land by "guerilla warfare;" and that to leave such ruffians in the enjoyment of free privileges is an injustice to the loyal and well-disposed of the community.

5. That the payment of the priests, which some politicians advocate, as a matter of expediency, is a mere cowardly concession which the party repudiate, and will only receive as it is given; they will give nothing in return, and will neither thank England for it, nor place themselves in a more friendly position towards the landed proprietors.

6. That God has laid down certain rules for the conduct of nations as well as individuals, and that, by joining any religious society, or, above all, by giving money for its purposes, we commit ourselves to their doctrinal errors, and give a sanction to their national sins; and that he who puts weapons into the hand of his enemy, and then tells him not to use them against himself, is only like the man who takes fire into his bosom, and then expects to escape unhurt.

7. That Lord Clarendon has so far acted the part of a consummate statesman and a determined warrior; that he has feared neither the slanders of the press in Ireland, nor the cold support of his own party at home; that he has earned for himself the good-will of all the honest portion of the Irish, of whatever shade of politics or religion; that he ought to be highly gratified by their approval which they have testified on all public occasions; and we sincerely hope that the reaction which has taken place in English public opinion will give him and the supporters of the law in Ireland the assistance which they require and deserve; and that, though England is sometimes slow in perceiving the truth, yet, when really convinced of it, she will act steadily, and endeavour, as far as possible, to give justice to Ireland.

Note.—While these sheets were in the press, we have heard that the Lord-Lieutenant has commuted the sentence of death in the cases of James Hayes, Michael Butler, and James Hourigan. The former was at some distance from the murder, though assisting in it. In the case of the two others, a point was raised as to Cleary's knowledge of approaching death, when he gave his evidence. As four out of the twelve Judges gave their opinion in favour of the prisoner, Lord Clarendon has remitted the extreme penalty of the law. Of the remaining convicts, two have been hanged at Ennis, and five at Limerick. The execution of Michael Howard has been deferred, and the five prisoners at Clonmel are still under sentence of death. It is remarkable, that confessions of guilt have been very general, and the criminals have attributed their fate to "the want of taking the advice of their clergy." This is a great change from the declarations of innocence common a few years ago, and shows that the priests are obliged to alter their game, as public opinion is now ready to mark them out as screening the criminal, and participating in the crime.

ART. VIII.—1. *The Christian State; or, the First Principles of National Religion. By the Rev.* T. R. BIRKS, *M.A., Rector of Kelshall, Herts.* London: Seeleys.

2. *Germany, England, and Scotland; or, Recollections of a Swiss Minister. By* J. H. MERLE D'AUBIGNÉ, *D.D.* London: Simpkin, Marshall, & Co.

3. *A Letter to the Right Hon. Lord John Russell, M.P., on the admission of Jews into Parliament. By the Rev.* T. R. BIRKS, *M.A.* London: Seeleys.

4. *Relations of Church and State, &c. By* J. R. PRETYMAN, *M.A., Vicar of Aylesbury.* London: Masters.

THE question of the relations of Church and State is one which has at all times attracted much of the attention of thoughtful men; but, within the last twenty or thirty years, it has been gradually acquiring continually increasing importance in England, partly from the efforts of Dissenters to convince the nation and the legislature of the truth of their views, which would lead to the destruction of the Church's temporalities; partly from a growing distrust, on the part of the Church herself, of the State's intentions in regard to her. At the epoch of the Reform Bill, Dissenters imagined that the time had come to realize their great object of the separation of Church and State, and the attainment at once of perfect equality with the Church; but in this they were disappointed, for the Whig ministers of the day threw cold water on their attempts, and the Church, instead of falling, only gained to appearance renewed stability, by the removal of its more unpopular defects. The tide of argument, too, was overwhelming. The Dissenters were beaten out of the absurd positions they had taken in denying even to a Christian sovereign the right to promote Christianity, and in refusing to Christians the right of giving property for the endowment of their churches. Old Thomas Chalmers came to the rescue—before his secession from the Kirk. In short, for a time, the dissenting argument broke down. Then, on the other hand, we know that there have been and are amongst the members of the Church some ardent and zealous minds, to whom the total separation of Church and

State seems in itself desirable, as opening the way to the restoration of the Church's powers of action in synod, and the free election of her ministers, which is precluded under the present system. Such earnest and zealous men look only on the benefits to be obtained by a total separation of Church and State, without sufficiently considering its dangers as regards the failure of provision for clergy in rural districts, which might thence ensue. We say this only on the supposition, that such is really one of the results contemplated at all by those of whom we speak; but we apprehend that there are persons to be found who wish for the separation of Church and State, without giving themselves the trouble of examining the question in any very practical point of view. The desire, however, for a moderate and limited freedom of action and self-government, in connexion with the State, has been and is widely felt in the Church, and by no particular class of men. Archbishop Whately is as much a supporter of the principle of self-government, to a certain limited extent, as the Bishop of Exeter. Dissatisfaction at the prevalent system of disposing of Government patronage in the Church, is to be found in all quarters, though it may be expressed in somewhat different terms, and with different views; but there is undoubtedly a general uneasiness in the mind of the Church regarding the exact position in which she is at present placed with a State, which, in its every day proceedings is proclaiming more and more distinctly that it wishes to be neutral between truth and error in religion.

We are living amidst the shadows of by-gone days. Antique forms, from which the spirit has long departed, still surround us, and persuade many of us in some sort that we are still under the system of three centuries ago. The English sovereignty—that power still so absolute and infallible in the fictions of the law—is little more than a high remembrance of former power. Its powers have passed to its ministers: the once absolute monarchs of England have nearly taken the place occupied by the last princes of the Merovingian dynasty. "Mayors of the palace" (but nominated by the *Parliament*) transact the affairs of the Crown for it, and exercise all its powers. An aristocracy, without its ancient feudal powers, shorn of the influence which it so long exercised over the representatives of the people—a State, *nominally* the protector and defender of the Church; supposed to be professing to follow the example of Hezekiah, Josiah, Constantine, and other defenders of the faith; and yet, in point of fact, profoundly indifferent to true religion, and willing to promote error in place of truth, at the demand of political expediency—such is the

strange state of things in which we find ourselves. In the midst of visions of the past, we do not quite look on the realities of the present; we imagine ourselves under a different system.

In our Church offices and canons, we are transported to the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, when the sovereign was really, and not nominally, the ruler and governor of this country, and when his ministers were simply his counsellors,—when he was not obliged to consult the will of Parliament in appointing those ministers. We are carried to those times when God was "the *only* ruler of princes;" when it was of vital importance to religion that *princes* should "incline to the will of God, and walk in his way;" when the sovereign was indeed our "governor," and had continual occasion to remember "*whose* minister" he was; when princes could, "by their thoughts, words, and works, study to preserve the people committed to *their* charge, in wealth, peace, and godliness;" when we were governed by the prince, and by those put in authority "under" him. These and similar expressions are still true, we know, according to the *theory* of the constitution; but we also know that they do in *fact* relate to a very different order of things, when Tudor and Stuart sovereignty fulfilled all the ideas of the pious compilers of our formularies; when ministries and parliaments did not rule sovereigns.

If any one will look soberly, and as a matter of fact, upon the *real* relation of the State in England to the Church, as distinguished from mere theories, he will see from the broad and simple facts of history, that a change in the ecclesiastical policy of the English government took place a century and a half ago, which could not fail to have immense consequences, however gradually developed. We must go some way back, in order to lay the state of the case fairly before the reader. We must begin at the Reformation, when our present system of relations between Church and State may be considered to have commenced. We need not enter into the peculiar and specific political or religious views which may have guided Henry VIII., Edward VI., Elizabeth, or the Stuarts, in their ecclesiastical actions; each had some under-current of special intention or theory in his day: but there was one grand principle and feature in their policy throughout; it was their object *to repress and to exterminate all dissent from the national Church; to make that Church literally and strictly co-extensive with the nation.* This was undeniably the policy of the State in England from 1531 to 1688. Now, then, mark its necessary result. The State, which was anxious for the predominance of the Church, had *a distinct policy and object in maintaining that Church in*

a state of the highest efficiency. To promote the well-being of the Church, was to promote directly the views of the State; and accordingly, while the royal prerogative in religious matters was strained to the highest pitch, and frequently indeed became absurd and ridiculous in its pretensions; still the steady purpose of sovereign after sovereign was to appoint able bishops and clergy; to encourage wholesome reforms in discipline; to provide ample endowments for all important posts. Look at the series of illustrious bishops who filled the episcopal thrones of England for a century and a half; men, indeed, amongst whom we may trace varieties of sentiment, but men of faithfulness, learning, sincerity, zeal; men recommended by no *parliamentary interest, or noble birth, or popularity*, but by their *high qualifications for office.* Look on such men as Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, Jewel, Parker, Whitgift, Ussher, Andrewes, Laud, Hall, Beveridge, Reynolds, Sheldon, Sancroft, Ken, and others, who crowd upon the memory of the English Churchman. *That* was our episcopate in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries! We look back to those times as the brightest of the English Church; and we think of the age of lead which followed. And whence arose the difference? The State, for a hundred and fifty years after the Reformation, wanted to crush dissent, and to place the English Church in exclusive power,—to be, in its turn (we admit), ruled by the State; but the moment that the State had arrived at the conviction that dissent was too strong to be repressed either by force, or by promoting the efficiency of the Church, its whole policy necessarily underwent a change: *the efficiency of the Church was no longer an object in State policy.*

We maintain, that, although it would have been the *duty* of Christian rulers to endeavour still to promote the efficiency of the Church, yet, taking statesmen as they commonly are,—men to whom the possession of political power is the great and sole object of ambition,—it could not be expected from such men that they would continue to feel any zeal for the welfare of the Church, when the great political stimulus was at an end. As soon as the State had made up its mind that it must be on amicable terms with the Dissenters, and allow them to follow their own views, the only object from that moment was to make the Church *useful* to the State, as far as it might be, *by employing its patronage for State purposes generally.* This patronage aided in maintaining the influence of the ministers, and in rewarding the efforts of the political parties of the day!

But we must not omit to take some notice of the labours of the authors whose works appear at the head of this paper. Mr. Birks is engaged chiefly in opposition to such writers as

Dr. Wardlaw and other Dissenters, in pointing out the duty of a Christian State in connexion with religion. His views, though proceeding from a very different school, agree in great points with those which Mr. Gladstone, in his earlier years, put forward, but which he now regards as impracticable. That is to say, they point out, in the fullest and most decided way, the duty of the State to maintain Christian truth, and advance it, *totis viribus*. We hail as brethren all those who in the present age of indifference, persist stedfastly in entering their protest in this matter on the side of truth. Nothing can be more clear, more certain, than the Christian ruler's duty to promote Christianity whenever and wherever he can. But what we have to deplore is, that this doctrine—so clearly written in the Scriptures and the conscience, is nationally rejected, and borne down by the contradictory principle, which is anti-Christian. Such faithful and honest writers as Mr. Birks may warn the statesman that he ought to encourage Christian truth—to discourage error, Romanism, idolatry, and all that is contrary to God's word. But these writers *have not the slightest effect upon the course of State policy*. Year after year, notwithstanding these protests, the State developes more and more the system on which it is acting—a system, not of Christianity, but of indifference to all Religion. Most devoutly do we wish that the State could imbibe the views of writers like Mr. Birks on the subject of its religious duties generally; but the evil is far too deeply seated for any mere literary efforts to assuage; it has been rooted in the general policy of the State for a century, and is expanding and bearing fruit amidst the revolutionary ideas and popular movements of the nineteenth century.

We may say that the Church of England generally—that is, all those of its members who are under the influence of religious feeling and principle—agree substantially with such writers. We all take the same view of the duties of the State; and we think it a grievous violation of those duties when we see acts of the State which evidently proceed on a wholly different view. We have been watching for thirty years the gradual development of that view in successive governments. For a time the principle of Religion held its ground against Emancipation. From the moment of emancipation a new order of things arose. The maxims of the Church of England on these points, and the ancient principle and aim of the State itself, are now limited to the more earnest and faithful members of the Church. They are actually *forgotten* by statesmen. Sir Robert Inglis, and the few who think with him in Parliament, are regarded by statesmen as

representatives of an obsolete and exploded system, not worth attending to.

In fact, if we contemplate the general state of the Empire, it is undeniable that the representatives of the old Church and State system, though standing on the basis of *Truth*, are reduced to the extremity of *political weakness*. The principles of the legislature of England from the time of the first great concessions to Romanism are wholly against their views. The whole tide of government practice is against them. Every young man of rising talent has deserted them. Then look at the actual power acquired in the House of Commons by Romanism, radicalism, dissent, liberalism—by all those influences which combine to proclaim liberty and equality in religion, and to pledge the State to absolute indifference or impartiality between the Church and all other forms of religion. Who could for a moment imagine that a Ministry, formed on the principles of "Church and State," —the principles of discouraging Romanism and dissent, would be able to hold its ground in a House of Commons led by Peel and Russell; or even a House of Lords, comprising such spiritual peers as a Wilberforce or a Thirlwall?

The system of government in this country is fixed. There is but one way to alter it. The Church is now passive; she remains in the hands of the temporal Ministers. She *looks* to them—if not to the Minister of the day, to his successor. She can conceive no other protection. She trusts that Peel may be less dangerous than Russell, or Gladstone than Peel. She does not see that *all Statesmen are involved, voluntarily or involuntarily, in a system.* They cannot escape from it in their general policy. They must attend to the claims of the parties which press on them. The Church does not in any way press on them. It remains *passive;* and therefore it cannot, and will not be considered. When the Church ceases to be *passive*—when it becomes a power in the State, with a *will* as well as a *principle*, it will influence statesmen; but not till then.

If strangers are liable to error in detail in treating of our institutions, they may sometimes, however, be enabled to perceive more clearly than we ourselves do, the more prominent and striking features of our condition—those features which arrest peculiarly the attention of other religious communions. Dr. Merle D'Aubigné is one of those intelligent observers whose remarks are at least worthy of attention, whether we may agree with them or not, and his view of the English Church, gathered during a visit recently paid to this country, are not without instruction. We need not say that Dr. Merle D'Aubigné's views are of the

most liberal complexion in reference to Christian communities, and that all assumption of "hierarchical" claims is the subject of his severest reprehension. Let us hear, then, this intelligent foreigner's opinions on the Church of England:

"Looking through the various parts of the constitution of the Church of England, I find certain institutions, which, according to my convictions, are not what they ought to be in a Church, and these I consider it my duty to point out. If there is a process termed *development*, to carry us away from Evangelical simplicity, ought there not to be another called *reformation*, to bring us back to it?

"Reformation should begin with the institutions destined to train up the Ministers of the Church. The Church of England is essentially an aristocratic Church. The members of the English clergy are taken from all ranks of society, and the sons of British peers sit sometimes as Ministers beside the sons of artizans. In this there are no doubt advantages; but there are also inconveniences. The worldliness of the clergy has long been a general complaint in England."—p. 129.

Dr. D'Aubigné recommends to the "Evangelical" party a greater attention to theological study. He remarks, and justly, on the defective study of theology in England, as compared with the study of the "philological, mathematical, physical, and economical sciences," and then proceeds thus:

"Not only at the basis,—in the Universities, is a reform needed, but also at the summit, in Church government.

"I might here instance one of the first elements of this government —the elections. The Church members in England have no choice in the election of their ministers, and what takes place in the election of bishops is still more extraordinary. When a vacant see is to be filled up, the chapter receives from the Crown a *congé d'élire*: but this writ is accompanied by another (a letter missive), in which the Crown designates the person whom the chapter is to appoint. If after twelve days the election does not take place, the king nominates the bishop by letters patent, and the chapter, if it opposes this, exposes itself to the penalties of *præmunire*, which renders the members liable to imprisonment 'during the king's pleasure.' At the same time the king takes possession of the revenues.

"But it is, in particular, of the supreme government of the Church that I would speak. In this the rights of the Church are still more completely sacrificed. The Church of England is composed of two Archiepiscopal provinces, Canterbury and York. Each of these has from very early times, probably since the reign of Edward I., held convocations or ecclesiastical synods; which being called to grant taxes to the Crown, levied upon Church property, always met at the same time with the parliament. . . .

"To these convocations once belonged, saving the king's prerogative, the government of the Church. But in 1717, at the time of the Jacobite

troubles, the debates having displeased government, the convocation was dissolved; and now it no longer exists. It is true that whenever a new parliament meets, the elections again take place; the convocation assembles at Westminster:—after this it adjourns *sine die*. . .

"The Crown might convoke the synods; but it never calls them together, and thus, by maintaining the *status quo*, it seems, in my opinion, to show that this right ought not to belong to it. A right which is never made use of is an absurdity. Can such a Church government subsist?

"I have often met with two very different opinions with regard to the Church of England—that which would preserve every thing in it, and that which would entirely abolish it. Neither of these opinions is mine. This Church, it must be owned, is dear to the people of England; and it has never ceased to bear valuable fruits to Christianity in general. But I do not think that in the present age the Church of England can preserve the institutions which she owes to the middle ages; and I am of opinion, that the changes, more or less violent, which the State introduced into it during the eighteenth century ought to be revised and corrected under a more Christian influence.

"I believe in the preservation of the Church of England; but I also believe in her transformation. The State has hitherto gagged and stifled her. I think that the Christian element within her ought to disengage and develop itself, and create a new independence and a new life. Of all evangelical churches, that of England is least ripe for independence . . . But the force of times and circumstances is bringing about a revolution which England little thought of. It is evident that since the Emancipation and other acts have given Roman Catholics and Dissenters seats in Parliament, it is an unreasonable and humiliating thing for the Church that Parliament should rule over her. Only think of the *tail* of O'Connell, of Young Ireland, those headstrong Papists being placed by law among the heads of the Protestant Church of England. It is one of those monstrosities which can only last a few years. The principles of eternal justice will soon set it right.

"The Anglican Church was formerly governed, as we have seen, by a body purely clerical—the convocation of the bishops and other members of the clergy. All were sensible of the immense abuses arising from this state of things, and, at the beginning of the last century, it received a government essentially lay—the Parliament. Every one feels, at present, that this state of things, also, cannot exist. There evidently must be a third. The Church of England must have a government independent of the Parliament, a government in which, doubtless, the bishops will sit; but in which will appear also the ordinary clergy, and wherein deputies from the parishes will have an influential voice. Every true Protestant should reject the hierarchical course, which may be very serviceable, perhaps, for ancient Egypt, or modern Rome, but is unsuited to Great Britain."—pp. 132—136.

We commend to the especial attention of the reader these extracts, and the remainder of the context. We can pardon Dr.

Merle D'Aubigné a few mistakes, for the substantial truth and clearness of his statements on these important subjects.

And now to revert to our subject. In what has been said we trust that our meaning has been made sufficiently plain. We are very far indeed from concurring with those who look on union between the Church and State as a thing *unlawful* or *undesirable* in the abstract, or as it *has* existed in England. Every churchman would doubtless be in a dilemma if he were called upon to approve every *single act or declaration of Henry VIII., or his Tudor or Stuart successors*, in ecclesiastical affairs, or to accept every declaration on the subject of ecclesiastical power in *Acts of Parliament* as a matter of faith; but, happily, we are in no such dilemma. Our Romish and Dissenting antagonists would pin us to every saying of our Tudor princes, and every line of the Statute Book, as if we acknowledged them as articles of faith; but with all deference we must decline the somewhat motley code of belief imposed upon us. Admitting that there were defects in the legislation of those times, and in the views of sovereigns, still we can on the whole fully and entirely enter into the views and feelings of churchmen in those times, and can see the reason of their attachment to the union of Church and State. The union *then* implied a conscientious and earnest watchfulness on the part of the State over the spiritual welfare of the Church. Give us those times again. Give us rulers whose avowed object is to make the Church co-extensive with the nation. Give us rulers, whose appointments of bishops and clergy are designed *on system* to promote the efficiency of the Church. Give us rulers, whose anxiety it is that the synods of the Church should be active in purifying abuses, in maintaining sound doctrine, in discouraging nonconformity and schism. Give us back such rulers as these, and we shall feel towards them as Andrewes, Hooker, Laud, and Cranmer felt.

But it does not follow that we should retain the same feelings when the State *retains* the powers which it acquired at the Reformation, without performing its *duties*—when it retains episcopal appointments, but has long ceased to act on the principle which alone justified its acquisition of them—when it retains the sole power of convening synods which it then gained, and only employs it for the purpose of extinguishing synodical action altogether—when it retains the authority and influence of supreme governor of the Church, given on the assumption of its zeal and interest to promote that Church's welfare; and has long since proclaimed its indifference to all forms of religion.

It is the vast change in the *actual* state of the case, which makes the forms and doctrines of the sixteenth and seventeenth century inapplicable to us.

Let us come to the actual state of things. For a century and a half the Church has been to the ministers of the day little more than an engine of state policy in the lowest sense. Its dignities and emoluments have been useful for promoting political objects. Judicious disposal of Church preferment has assisted in gratifying political adherents, or in silencing troublesome priests; it has also enabled a minister to keep under his immediate control one "arm of the public service," the Church, by appointing bishops, and other dignitaries, of known pliancy of character, and of a principle which depends on contingencies. There is also the subordinate advantage of enabling the statesman of the day to gratify any private friendships or claims of family connexion, by pensioning them on the Church. This latter point of view is, we are aware, one to which the vision of ministers of state rarely condescends to contract itself. Mere personal gratification is an object too insignificant to attract particular notice from men whose minds are fixed on the great and leading point of retaining power, either for the benefit of the nation, or of a great party in it. The "responsibility" which such statesmen feel in disposing of bishoprics is very high indeed in their own opinion—the interests of a *government* are concerned in it! If patronage be so dispensed as to injure in any way the interests of the ministry or party in power, a grave and serious charge may be made on so indiscreet an act,—the interests of the *public service* may suffer in consequence! Ministers probably, in general, are under the influence of a feeling of "responsibility" of this kind in making Church appointments. It is a responsibility which has doubtless pressed alike on the minds of such conscientious statesmen as a Peel or a Russell, a Walpole or a Bolingbroke.

Ireland affords at this moment an illustration of the principle to which we have alluded as actuating our statesmen, and their broad and simple view of the duties of Government in the disposal of the Crown patronage. It happened that, some years ago, the Government of the day deemed it expedient on political grounds to withdraw all support from a system of education grounded on the study of the sacred Scriptures, and with a view to gratify the Romish party in Ireland to establish a national system of education, in which it announced that Romanists and Churchmen should be educated *without* studying the sacred volume. To this plan the infinite majority of the Irish prelates, clergy, and laity declared themselves opposed, on grounds of religious principle. They distinctly and repeatedly took this ground, and have never receded from it.

The Government conceived that such an opposition as this was calculated to embarrass the plans which they had formed for the

benefit of Ireland. And they have, accordingly, under a deep sense of the "responsibility" attaching to the dispensation of Church patronage, systematically, and notoriously, for several years, made the acquisition of bishoprics and all other benefices in Government patronage, *contingent on the relinquishment of those principles which the Church of Ireland regards as identified with religious Truth.* Clergymen are, in fact, offered high preferment in the Church, if they betray what the Church believes to be her cause. The most deserving and worthy clergy are excluded from the possibility of rising in their profession, simply by retaining the opinions conscientiously held by the great majority of the Bishops and Clergy of Ireland. This may seem to some persons rather more than a hardship on individuals. There may be persons who look on such a line of conduct as unjust to the Church at large. But it is evident that Government has wholly different views; it contemplates the subject simply as a matter of State policy; and acts boldly and consistently on its views of responsibility in this respect. We have not the slightest doubt that Lord Clarendon, or any other Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, whether of Whig or nominally Conservative appointment, would act on this rule with a feeling of most cordial self-satisfaction.

The Rev. Dr. Miller, Vicar-General of Armagh, in a pamphlet recently published, observes in several places on the present system of Church patronage in Ireland, as a matter of notoriety [1]. He observes, that, although the Government does not present to as many parochial benefices as the Bishops do, the Bishoprics, and other dignities of the Church, are "the great prizes in the lottery of advancement, and to them, accordingly, will the views of the able and the eminent be directed,"—that if a clergyman "is uneasy in his exposure to the general imputation of cupidity for attaching himself to the National Board, he should address his complaint to the Government, which has so limited its ecclesiastical patronage, *that none except the adherents of the Board can hope to share it.*"

A beneficed clergyman of the diocese of Limerick, in consequence of his endeavours to check flagrant abuses in a Relief Committee, became exposed to popular odium, and his life was endangered. He made application to Government to facilitate his removal to an equivalent benefice elsewhere. His application was favourably received at first; but *inquiry was made into his sentiments as regarded the National Board of Education*, and, on its being ascertained that he adhered to the views of the Church of Ireland, his request was refused.

[1] *Supplement to the Case of the Church Education Society in Ireland, &c. By George Miller, D.D., Vicar-General of Armagh.* Dublin: Oldham. London: Seeleys.

So notorious is the practice of the Ministry in employing the Church preferment of Ireland to bribe the clergy to adopt the Government views on education, that a "Letter to the Lord-Lieutenant on National Education," recently published by some advocate of the Government, openly *justifies* the practice of coercion, in administering the ecclesiastical patronage of the Government, as agreeable to "the rules of common prudence and common policy."

A communication from a correspondent of the "Morning Post," dated Cork, Feb. 6th, states some very remarkable facts on this subject:—

"Perhaps your readers are not so generally aware of the fact that by the conscientious refusal to take an active part in the proceedings of the Education Board—that by such a refusal every clergyman writes himself down in a proscribed list, the names upon which are inexorably shut out from all Church preferments which the political minister can influence. It is so, however. Learning, piety, and eloquence are alike subservient to the indispensable preliminary. 'Is he one of our men? Is he one of those who will say aye to our aye, through whatever evolutions we may choose to order his conscience, in compliance with the enlightened spirit of the age?' It may be incredible, but it is not less an indisputable fact, that, at the moment I am writing, *the main body of the Irish clergy are in this state of proscription.*

"I must give you one speaking example. The Rev. Mr. Brady (by the bye, a brother of the present very respectable lord chancellor,) for a number of years performed the most laborious duties of the sacred ministry in this neighbourhood with a self-denying zeal, whose reward won the respectful gratitude of his ecclesiastical superiors, and of the needy and numerous charge to whom the labour of his life was devoted. Some time ago he was apprised that a preferment was open to him, the emoluments of which, modest enough, would still have made his position one of those rare exceptional ones that afford something like a gentlemanly subsistence to the incumbent. The offer was not refused, arrangements seemed all completed, and Mr. Brady prepared to move to his new sphere of exertion. But now came the gently intimated expression of official conviction, that 'of course' the reverend gentleman would have no objection to make himself generally useful *in supporting the views of the Education Commissioners.* This, he lost no time in protesting, was one of the things which, equally 'of course,' he would have no hand or part in, as it was entirely opposed to what he believed was his paramount duty. *The objection proved an insuperable bar against the efficacy of Mr. Brady's undoubted and acknowledged claims!!*"

In truth, this mode of dispensing Government patronage in Ireland is one with which history is perfectly familiar. Every one knows that the union of Ireland with Great Britain was carried by Mr. Pitt, by a large distribution of rewards and

promises. We do not bear in memory the exact number of *bishoprics* which were promised to the younger members of noble families, in addition to peerages, places, and sums of money to the elder branches; but this we do know, and all the world knows the same, that for a long series of years vacancies on the Episcopal bench in Ireland were filled by the scions of her aristocracy, in consequence of Union pledges, without reference to character or conduct,—and that many persons were then appointed bishops, who were very far indeed from being an honour to their profession.

These are well known facts, illustrative of the views and principles on which Ministers generally act in dispensing their Church patronage. We have no doubt that some weighty reasons of state induced the appointment of such a man as the Earl of Bristol, Bishop of Derry, who spent his life in foreign travel; or of Agar, Archbishop of Cashel, and other money-loving prelates, who accumulated enormous fortunes from their ecclesiastical benefices.

The Irish Episcopate has been regularly applied by the government for a long series of years, to provide for the younger brothers of the Irish nobility and minor aristocracy. At this moment even, the Irish prelates are almost all members of noble families. The deaneries have been uniformly disposed of by Government on the same principle. "Lords" and "Honourables" have occupied every post of emolument or dignity, except in those cases in which promotion has been the reward of political services rendered by individuals to Government.

We speak of matters which are perfectly notorious; it would be unnecessary and unadvisable to enter into further details, which would be painful to individuals. That in a few rare instances, men of eminence without aristocratic claims have been raised to the Episcopate in Ireland is true; but if it has been so, they have generally established some political claims on Government, or on some of its members. Magee would never have been a bishop, if he had not been an able electioneerer; Jebb owed his advancement quite as much to the policy of "Conciliation," as to his admirable writings. Learning and piety have rarely been dreamt of by the Irish Government as qualifications for promotion. Within our recollection, Lord Liverpool was the only minister who ever dwelt on such matters *when* he was unfettered by the claims of party, or the promises of preceding ministers.

Persons who look at this systematic exercise of Government patronage, simply as bearing on the interests of Christianity, will of course take one view of such transactions. But then ministers in general take these matters in a different point of view To

them the whole question of patronage is simply political: religion has nothing, and ought to have nothing to do with it. Here are certain places and dignities, to which certain legal duties are annexed, and which are only tenable by persons in holy orders. These are the sole conditions. The duties are a "bagatelle," in the opinion of ministers (Sir James Graham's opinions here occur to us), and the qualification does not require any examination into any other fitness. If once a clergyman, a person is eligible to a *bishopric:* nothing more is requisite. This is the broad and simple view of statesmen[2], and on this they generally act without attempting any such superfluous refinement as inquiring into the *fitness* or *worthiness* of persons named for the Episcopate, or for promotion generally.

We have been hitherto chiefly referring to the exercise of Government patronage in the Irish Church. And we have done so in order to show the operation of the ministerial principles where they have had the amplest scope for their exercise. Unchecked in Ireland by the formalities of election by Dean and Chapter, and Archiepiscopal Confirmation; the minister nominates his bishop by letters patent, and presents him to the Archbishop, demanding his consecration. If the Archbishop refuses, he falls under Præmunire. So that in Ireland the minister has the fullest scope for the development of his view of the question; and accordingly the Irish Episcopate has all along exemplified those views in a more marked and striking manner than the English Episcopate.

In England, there has been some check upon the ministerial appointment, not merely from the preservation of the ancient forms of election and confirmation, though oppressed by the legislation of King Henry VIII., but there has been a far more important check in *public opinion*, on which ministers themselves are at all times more or less dependent for power. The Church of England, strong in its numerical force, constituting by far the majority of the English nation, was a body which ministers could not venture to outrage grossly by making scandalous appointments, because the result would have been dangerous to their own power. The case was widely different in Ireland, because the Church being very much in the minority there, public

[2] Such also would seem to be the view of the Bishop of St. David's, if report speaks correctly of what his Lordship recently advanced in the House of Lords, on occasion of the Bishop of Exeter's presenting a petition for the repeal of Præmunire. This reverend prelate stated the principle of the law to be, that "when the Crown exercised this power it was limited to a certain class of subjects, and these in the eye of the law were *all equally qualified to exercise the functions of the Episcopal office.*" To this principle his Lordship expressed no dissent!

opinion was never opposed to bad appointments. The Romanists were not displeased at them, nor the Presbyterians; and the aristocracy, who were all gratified in succession, were all, of course, in favour of so convenient and accommodating a system.

In England, however, the Government is always obliged to be more wary, because the Church is or was a body which could support a government or endanger it. Sound policy, therefore, dictated to successive ministries some regard to public opinion in their episcopal appointments. In England, consequently, it has been generally customary for prime ministers to lay before the Archbishops of Canterbury the names of persons designed, in the ministerial mind, for promotion to the Episcopate; and this may perhaps, have proved not inconvenient to the minister, on various occasions, in saving him from the awkwardness and even risk of making decidedly bad and *unpopular* appointments.

But let us here pause a moment. *Public opinion* has been and will be in England some protection to the Church. We fully admit the truth of this. It has been the *only* safeguard, humanly speaking, that we have had for a century and a half. If this safeguard had not existed, we know not how the Church could have conscientiously submitted so long to the law of Henry VIII. Let us, however, look more closely at the actual benefits which have arisen from the influence of public opinion, and let us see what it does not and cannot do for us. We see then, that, as a general rule, it has prevented the appointment of bishops of notoriously immoral character, or of openly unsound doctrine. But, on the other hand, this system has left the minister with ample liberty to employ the patronage of the Church for the broad and simple object of promoting the benefit of the *Government* only. Guarded by private consultation with the chief bishop of the Church, against any appointment which might be *dangerous to the Government*, and having always to deal with a Metropolitan selected by Government for pliancy of character and subordination to the State, he is free to permit his choice to rest on such individuals as may present claims founded on high political connexion, on relation to families whose influence or votes in either House are of importance to the Government, or on services rendered to such families in the capacity of tutors, schoolmasters, &c. One prelate, accordingly, attains the Episcopal bench because he has been tutor to a prince or a marquis; another, because his relations command votes in the House of Commons; another, because it is desirable to gratify the universities, and so a professor or a head of a house is selected. One has been the tutor of a prime minister; another, a brother of a lord chancellor. One has done some service to a royal

favourite; another has rendered political service and made political friends by electioneering, or by some declaration of opinion in favour of Government at some important crisis; another is merely a brother and cousin to a certain number of influential noble families. These, we say (and the matter is too notorious to be denied), have been and are the simple grounds and reasons which have very commonly influenced successive ministers in their appointments of bishops. The motives have been wholly and entirely secular (as a general rule); the Minister has always looked solely to the welfare of his government and of the State as dependent on it.

We are unwilling to refer to particular cases; but in the present position of the Church of England, no ill-timed delicacy must prevent the open expression of opinion on questions of vital importance. To speak of Dr. Hampden's appointment would be superfluous, after all that has passed; but the appointment at Manchester appears to us little less blameable. Who ever heard of Mr. Lee as a clergyman before his recent appointment? We do not dispute his qualifications as a *schoolmaster*, but no evidence has ever yet appeared of his qualifications as a *bishop*. As a preacher, we learn from published statements that he is inefficient; as a pastor, he has had no experience; and as a divine, he is unknown. What, then, are his qualifications? In both these appointments, and in others which are hinted at as probable, we seek in vain for those characters of high and holy devotion, those earnest exertions and labours, not in the cause of the science of this world, but in the service of Jesus Christ, which ought to be the *first great* qualifications for the Episcopate. What has the mere restoration of churches, the writing of histories, or mathematical attainments to do with such things as this? Are these the qualifications of *bishops?* Are these the qualifications REQUIRED BY GOD'S WORD?

We do not mean to say that there have not been exceptional cases in which some minister has been influenced by religious feeling in making Church appointments; and we are also aware that from time to time, and of late, perhaps, more frequently, ministers have sought to make occasional *popular* appointments to benefices. We have seen them encouraging "learning," by appointing Greek scholars, schoolmasters, and *geologists*, to bishoprics and deaneries! These latter cases are, however, simply in accordance with the general views of Government in disposing of Church preferments. They are intended to strengthen a government by the weight of public opinion. And now let us look at the result.

We have, in the first place, possessed for a century and a half a series of bishops, who have been on the whole men of respect-

able character. Nay, beyond this, we may and must say that men of superior character and ability have been found on the Episcopal bench, though such qualifications were not sought for as a general rule. On the whole, however, we must in candour and Christian sincerity say, that many men have been appointed bishops in England, whose qualifications for the office would never have been discovered by any one but by a minister. We have possessed (we make many exceptions, of course, and rather refer to the past,) a series of bishops of aristocratic habits or connexions—bishops who have been rather temporal lords than ministers of Jesus Christ—bishops who have rarely in any point exceeded the precise limits of their duty prescribed by law—bishops who have neither possessed the power nor the inclination to preach the Gospel—bishops whose apparent object has been too frequently to throw a damp on any exhibition of *zeal* in the Church's cause, and to discourage methodism, evangelicalism, or any other system which exhibited life and energy—a series of bishops whose primary object and leading policy was to "keep things quiet," and preserve the "peace" of the Church at almost any sacrifice. To say that our bishops have not often been good men, well-meaning men, sometimes excellent men, would be an injustice; but in very many cases they have been men who have more or less exhibited traces of the source from which they derived their appointment.

Hence even now, when great measures are brought forward which the Church in general, both clergy and laity, are strongly convinced will be most injurious to the interests of the Church and religion, a portion of the Episcopate *uniformly* sides with some political party which is engaged in attempting to carry such measures. We only remember *one* case in which the whole Episcopate of England opposed a Government measure—the abolition of Church-rates. So it is, that the Episcopate has regularly furnished votes in favour of such measures as the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, Romish emancipation, the suppression of the ten Irish bishoprics, the endowment of Maynooth, the "godless" Colleges Bill, the suppression of protective duties on corn, on the price of which the incomes of the *parochial clergy* are dependent. Every ministerial measure, however much calculated to injure the Church, finds some bishops to support it! If Government proposes plans of education with a view to draw more entirely the control of the youth within its own power, it is always certain to find some prelates willing to credit its professions, and to promote its views.

We feel that it would be most uncharitable to imagine for a moment that these worthy prelates are not satisfied of the rectitude of their conduct in such matters; but this we do say, that

many bishops have a very singular facility in being convinced, that the Government which has promoted them, or may promote them, is always in the right, and that the majority of the Church, when opposed to ministerial measures, is in the wrong, and does not understand its own interests. The majority of the prelates were exceedingly anxious to retain Sir Robert Peel in power, and supported him very steadily, even to the last, notwithstanding all his measures in favour of popery! No matter what may be the course of Government policy, it finds support from bishops who have been made by the political party which is in power, or who are anxious for some reason to support it. In *one* case, however, qualifications of a certain kind have been usually sought for by ministers.

It has been notoriously the policy of the Government always to place prelates of yielding and timid characters in the office of *metropolitans.* These prelates being in frequent intercourse with the Ministers, who have managed the Church through them, have been generally under the influence of the Government of the day, however much they may have persuaded themselves that they were merely doing their duty in promoting the harmonious action of Church and State. We conceive that the *continual intercourse* of the heads of the Church with the State, when those prelates feel that their appointment is derived entirely from the State, and when the State has selected its own instruments for those high offices, is not much calculated to promote an independent tone of mind, or to inspire any single-minded devotion for the cause of God. It is apparently calculated to create useful auxiliaries to ministries. It is not so certain that it will promote a resolution to "render to God the things that are God's," as to "render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's."

With metropolitans of such a character as we have had for a century, ministers have found it easy to manage the Church. Fearful of *experiments* of any kind, such good men would retain matters as much as possible in their actual position, which, however, throws *every thing* into the hands of the Minister and the political parties of the day. Such metropolitans would prefer the system of making Acts of Parliament, and nominating royal or parliamentary commissions, to the perilous experiment of convening a synod of the Church, and restoring those functions which have gone out of use, since ministers have acquired the absolute and undisputed control of Church patronage. Such metropolitans are ready and willing to become, with the Bishop of London, or one or two other prelates, the *only* spiritual body whom the Government thinks it advisable to consult. They are willing to imagine, that a system which in fact concentrates all power in their own hands, to the *exclusion* of the bishops and other members of the Church,

(to whom it equally belongs by the laws and customs of England,) and in the hands of the Minister, is more convenient, works better, and so forth. Such metropolitans gradually acquire such notions of their exclusive power from their *continued association with Government*, that when ecclesiastical commissioners are appointed for the purpose of re-arranging all the dioceses of England and Wales, and taking the cathedral property; or for creating new dioceses; or, again, when plans are propounded by a foreign sovereign for founding a bishopric abroad, on the provisions of which much and most serious difference of opinion exists; the metropolitans, and one or two other distinguished prelates, accept without difficulty the office of regulating all these important affairs on their own responsibility, to the exclusion of their right reverend brethren and the Church generally. Under the present system, indeed, the authority of the Episcopate has been for a long series of years virtually concentrated by the policy of Government in a few prelates; the remainder, though retaining seats in parliament, are not called into council, but are left to manage the affairs of their own particular dioceses. The government of the Church at large has been permitted to fall into the hands of a very select body.

The Government influence has been, and continues to be, very great, more especially over the Heads of the Church; and this feeling extends to all who are connected with them and under their influence. The very men who, apart from such associations, would look primarily to the welfare of the Church, are fascinated as they come within the sphere of the higher dignitaries of the Church; and, like them, become deferential and pliant to the wishes of Government, deceived by its professions, and attached to the established system. Principle becomes, to some extent, replaced by policy; and aspirations for reformation are laid aside as impracticable.

We might trace the results of this system of appointment still further: but we forbear. We fear that our remarks might do more harm in one way than good in another. We do not wish to probe the evil of secularity too deeply. At the same time, when we refer to the system which has in too many instances prevailed in the disposal of Episcopal patronage, and in which claims founded on long and faithful services to the Church in the office of curate, have been postponed to the ties of family connexion or interest, we feel assured that the reader will agree with us, that the example of secularity set by the State has not been without imitation. We refrain from more than a mere allusion to the combination of the system of plurality in benefices with that of Nepotism, or the disgraceful and dangerous results which

have thence arisen. In examining the catalogue of canons and dignitaries of cathedrals, these thoughts will present themselves with peculiar force; and, in fact, it was the notorious *abuse* of that patronage—patronage divided between the Government and the bishops—which brought about in the end a sweeping measure for the reduction of chapters.

Such are the results which have followed from ministerial patronage in England. The reference which has been usually made to the Archbishop of Canterbury, has protected the Church, as a general rule, from the appointment of bishops of notoriously heretical doctrine, or of corrupt morals. But we must take leave to say, that it has permitted much of secularity, much of indolence, much of incapacity, to take its place on the Episcopal bench. It has brought into the sanctuary a great deal of the spirit of the world. It has created a subservient, timid, and divided Episcopate; an Episcopate which, by its divisions on great questions, almost always in effect injures and destroys the cause of the Church whenever it is the Minister's policy to introduce measures dangerous to that Church.

We say this in a spirit not only of the highest reverence for the apostolical office to which these prelates have been called, but with general respect for the actual occupants of Episcopal sees, and sincere veneration for some of them. With all that deference and respect, however, we cannot close our eyes to certain truths which the history of a century and a half have sufficiently established, and which the events of the day press forcibly on our notice. Some churchmen perhaps may not agree in some theological points with the Bishop of Calcutta; others, perhaps, may feel something of the same kind with regard to the Bishop of New Zealand; but every one must feel, that if something of the apostolical sincerity and zeal which those bishops manifest were uniformly *sought for* in making appointments of English bishops, religion, at least, would be a gainer.

And now to turn to another view of the question. Hitherto we have looked upon the subject chiefly as bearing upon politics or external matters. We have shown the principles and maxims on which statesmen, as a general rule, always have gone, and always will go in their use of Church patronage—we have shown the mere secularity of these motives, and the secularity which has followed in their train. We have traced the too frequent character of the Episcopate created under this system, and its results. But we now come to look upon the Episcopate in its true light. We turn from the merely political view of the subject—to contemplate it in the aspect which it ought to present to the Christian.

To the Christian, the Episcopate, and, in general, the offices of the Christian ministry, present a totally different aspect from that which they present to the statesman and the politician. He believes—it is an article of his faith—that the orders of the Church did not derive their origin from the State, but from the will and appointment of God—that their end is not to support human governments, or to maintain political parties or ministers, but to promote the salvation of souls. To assert that elections to the Christian ministry of any order or degree, ought to be directed primarily and chiefly to the maintenance of some political system, or the welfare of some political party, would in his view be scarcely short of infidelity. What is it, in fact, but setting the interests of the men of this world above the interests of souls—subjecting the kingdom of God to the kingdom of this world?

The Christian sees in the Scriptures certain qualifications for the office of bishops and ministers in the Church of God. He sees those qualifications recognized as the leading principles of the Church at all times. He finds them in the most solemn and forcible manner contained in the formularies of the Church of England. In the Office for the Consecration of Bishops, prayer is first made that all bishops, "the pastors of thy Church," may "*diligently preach* thy word." Then we are reminded that a bishop must be "apt to teach," "vigilant," not "covetous," one "that ruleth well his own house;" that he must take heed to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made him overseer, "*to feed* the Church of God;" that he must follow the example of Simon, and "*feed* the lambs" and the sheep of Jesus Christ, if he would prove his love; that he is sent to teach and baptize, teaching men to observe all things which the Lord hath commanded him.

Then the Bishops present to the Metropolitan one whom they describe as a "*godly* and well-learned man." The Archbishop invites the congregation to prayer in *imitation* of our Lord, who continued a whole night in prayer before HE "*chose and sent forth his twelve Apostles.*" Prayer is then made "before WE ADMIT AND SEND FORTH this person presented unto us, to the work *whereunto we trust* THE HOLY GHOST HATH CALLED HIM." We need not pursue the subject further in the Consecration Service, which breathes throughout the same spirit. The Church evidently believes that she is discharging a great and responsible *duty* in consecrating bishops. She supposes that the Crown presents to her persons chosen with reference to their spiritual qualifications. Her exhortations, lessons, prayers, &c., would be a mere mockery if they had not been written on the supposition that bishops have been chosen with an especial view to their

fitness for the office. Such *was* doubtless the view which was taken at the period when these solemn offices of consecration were prepared and revised. The Church rightly believed that the Sovereign was desirous to appoint worthy bishops. Ministers and politics had nothing to do with those appointments. They were made by the Crown either directly or by royal commission, or by the Heads of the Church with the Crown. "Godly and well-learned men" were then *on system* appointed to Episcopal sees. The Sovereign was, in more than name, "Defender of the Faith."

But this has long passed away. The Church has for a century been the chief branch of ministerial patronage. And it now constitutes almost the only patronage in which the Minister may attend to political claims, *without regarding qualifications for office.*

And yet, when we look on the Episcopal office in its real point of view, disengaging it from the mere trappings of temporal rank, wealth, and patronage, which have clung round it in the course of ages—so solemn and sacred is its responsibility and dignity, that, in the comparison, the soul revolts with a kind of impatience from those wretched outside trappings as things beneath contempt. What are all the pomp and grandeur of this world—the princely rank and wealth—in comparison with the high mission of the Christian bishop to feed the lambs of Jesus Christ—to teach the words which He has entrusted to him—to save his own soul in so doing? How earthly is that heart which can dwell upon the one as if it were the sum and substance and vitality of the Episcopate; and can put the other—with its awful responsibilities—its sublime rewards—its toils, labours, anxieties, self-denials, prayers, watchings, and fastings, out of sight and out of mind! "Who is sufficient for these things?" was the question of an Apostle. But, oh! how would that Apostle have reproved this Church and this nation, if he could have looked upon our fallen state for the last century—if he could have seen bishop after bishop called to the apostolic office with no view except to uphold some ephemeral and unprincipled government of this world? In looking on these sad times, our only consolation is, that the Church has been rather deceived by the State than voluntarily acquiesced in such a state of things. She trusted that the Sovereign would discharge the duty to which he was bound by so many solemn responsibilities. She trusted still, when the power of Sovereigns had passed away to their subjects. She trusted that Ministers themselves would, in their ecclesiastical appointments, as they did in their political professions, promote the true welfare of the Church. When one minister after another failed, she still

looked, and—strange to say—still continues to look to some future minister as her patron and her friend! Surrounded as she is by the fading images of times in which the State was indeed, for its own interests, her strenuous advocate and reformer, she can scarcely open her eyes to the tremendous change in the relations between Church and State. Uneasy she has been at the legislative acts of thirty years—but she has not mentally combined them, and seen the system on which they were proceeding. We cannot excuse the Church for this want of perception. And yet amidst her failings she has been preserved.

Nothing but the special interference of Divine Providence could have given us the many good bishops we have had, and prevented the Church from perishing utterly. Yet how grievous were her losses—Wesleyan Methodism expelled from her bosom, which might, by a more highly-qualified Episcopate, have been preserved and reformed—dissent and infidelity increasing, while the Church lay still, waiting for help from the State—then Romanism gaining new strength and vigour—the Church divided by controversies—and the State on which the hierarchy always leant, turning steadily towards a course of openly irreligious policy, casting down all the bulwarks of the Church, throwing open the flood-gates to the tide of Romanism, dissent, Methodism, Judaism, and Infidelity.

There are those who may look on such sentiments as proceeding from mere "troublers of Israel." We take up the phrase which has been lately applied in another way, and ask wherefore should we cry, "Peace, peace, when there is no peace?" To the Christian, and to the man of the world, the system of Church appointments must necessarily appear in a different point of view. We cannot have peace while the land is filled with the evil results of a long-continued system of corruption. We ought not to sit still and permit the Lord's cause to be given over to the destroyer. Our Episcopate must be multiplied,—and if so, the source of its nomination must be purified from the venality and corruption which always attaches to ministerial patronage. The rights of the Crown must be respected and maintained [3], but the Episcopate must be liberated from its subserviency to the

[3] While we say this, we would caution all those who are interested in obtaining for the Church *real* securities for the appointment of good bishops, against any expressions which might be understood as recognizing the right of the Crown, *under all circumstances, and at all times*, to appoint to bishopries. Be it remembered, that there was a time when no sovereign appointed to bishopries,—that Christian sovereigns *only gradually* acquired the privilege,—that the sovereigns of England *have not at all times* appointed,—that cases *may be conceived*, in which the Church could not consent to the continuance of this privilege, but must reject it at all hazards. It is sufficient to say, that we *do not* contemplate any removal of the appointment of bishops from the Crown.

ministry of the day. Its members must be selected for merit, not for connexion,—for piety and Christian zeal, not for pliancy of character. While the nomination of bishops is vested, *in the first instance*, in the ministry of the day, so long, we fear, will all the abuses we speak of continue. It would be in vain to give Chapters or Archbishops the power of rejecting, at election or confirmation, ministerial nominees, if the only ground of objection were some *positive and proved* error in doctrine, or immorality in conduct. Would this guard the Church against what is, in our opinion, an evil as great as immorality of life, or error in doctrine, —and that is, *a worldly-minded, lukewarm, time-serving* Episcopate? Certainly not. Would it save the Church from the system of ministerial corruption, which has so long paralysed her energies, and secularized to so great an extent her Episcopate and her priesthood? Would it create an Episcopate free from the trammels of ministerial and political obligations, and at liberty to exert its powers with undivided energy for the welfare of the Church? Would it give us holy, apostolical, zealous, humble men? No—we have had a century's experience of what ministerial patronage can do; and that we have survived it—is a miracle. We cannot *trust* it. We may be compelled to yield to it; but do not let us *voluntarily* sanction it.

There is, in our opinion, only one mode in which the Church could be rescued from the danger of receiving a series of worldly and unworthy bishops from ministers. If some Body were elected by a national synod, to which all ministerial nominations should be subjected, with *full and unlimited power* of rejecting all nominations of persons whom it did not consider *worthy* of the office of bishop, without the necessity of assigning *any specific objections to doctrine or morals*,—in such case an effective check would be established against the appointments of bishops who have no merit or qualifications. But any such contraction of the ministerial power would be nearly as unacceptable as the entire removal of the nomination to some other hands; and elsewhere we are convinced that it ought to be removed, and can safely be removed. Let us not be misunderstood as suggesting any diminution of the royal authority, such as it is. Let the Crown *retain the powers which it now possesses of appointing bishops*. But let such powers as *ministers* have appropriated to themselves, in appointing to bishoprics, be put in other hands, under the Crown, but independent of the Minister. Let the synod of the whole Church of England, both clerical and lay, nominate a select body to the Queen, as her advisers in ecclesiastical appointments. Let those representatives of the Church, selected for their devotion to religion, present to the Minister, or the Crown, the names of

persons thoroughly qualified for promotion to vacant benefices, and let the forms of confirmation become a reality, under proper regulations; and we think that all parties, except the Minister of the day, would be satisfied. The danger of popular elections would be avoided; the right of the Crown would be preserved, and the Church would be in perfect security. We feel assured that the claims of the Church for proper securities of *some kind* cannot be long or effectually resisted. We are of opinion that no measure which would not *wholly* exclude the ministry of the day would be fully sufficient: but we trust that any measure presenting a real check on the ministerial prerogative, would be supported.

It is high time for churchmen to open their eyes to the progress of events. The whole course of State policy in ecclesiastical matters has changed within the last century and a half. The effects of this change, however, have only gradually developed themselves. Still retaining the vast body of the population—still retaining the energies which persecution in the Great Rebellion, and subsequent perils, and a succession of illustrious bishops had implanted within her, the English Church long retained some influence, even after Government had changed its ecclesiastical views. Popery lay crushed beneath penal laws, as a dangerous faction, opposed to the Protestant succession of the throne. But in time Popery and Sectarianism gained political influence, by dint of agitation, and the aid of political partisans, who raised themselves to power by their advocacy of pretended popular rights. The French Revolution, operating, in its principles, on the enormous multitudes of our manufacturing population, left without any effectual provision for their spiritual welfare, raised a mass of radicalism and infidelity, which, combined with the revived powers of popery, and the active energies of dissent, have totally changed the face of things. The mob who in 1791 burnt Dr. Priestley's chapel, and assailed the friends of the French Revolution, have now become Chartist, Radical, and Socialist.

And now, for a long series of years, government after government has been engaged in breaking down all the restraints by which the legislation of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries sought to discourage separation from the National Church. The whole system of successive governments ought to be to the members of the Church a convincing proof of the *fundamental change* which has taken place in the views of the State in England. The Church is still recognized nominally, and by the forms of the constitution, as the National Church—the Church to which the State is more particularly allied—which it prefers in some sort to other religious communions; but the spirit of these forms is

extinct; the Legislature shuns every act by which it might testify its adhesion to the Church or its interests. It is content to let certain forms and privileges remain for the present. It does not seek to confiscate Church property, or to expel bishops from Parliament; but it will not take a single step in *favour* of the Church, unless equivalent concessions are made to the enemies of the Church. They would fain endow Romanism, if it could be induced to accept the bribe. *Equality* of all religious communions in the eye of the law, is the doctrine which has been, year after year, advocated in Parliament. The repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, the emancipation and endowment of Romanism, the admission of Jews, the thousand other acts and proceedings at home and abroad, in the colonies and in Ireland, ought to bring conviction at length to the most prejudiced mind that the State in England has totally changed its views with regard to the Church; that there is no political *principle* which now leads it to uphold the National Church. Mr. Birks has referred to this state of things in the excellent pamphlet on the admission of Jews into Parliament, which we have placed at the head of our remarks:—

"A further reason for the removal of Jewish disabilities has been shown from the course and tenor of recent legislation. Its whole tendency, it is said, has been in one direction; to remove all civil distinctions, founded on the difference of religious creeds and opinions. . . . . It is true indeed, and may be owned without scruple, that the changes of the last twenty years have been such as the objection implies. The fact is plain, but the inference which has been drawn from it is utterly groundless. . . . . The principle which advocates the admission of Jews into Parliament, because it agrees with the course of previous legislation, would have equally justified the crucifixion of our blessed Lord. . . . . Our nation, like Balaam, may be suffered for a time to walk in the way of *its own choice*, while its statesmen echo boldly the scornful question of Pilate, and worldly wealth is nationally coveted and followed, at the sacrifice of truth and righteousness. But those who can read the signs of the times will only tremble at the dangerous permission."

These are the words of truth and soberness, but they fall on ears that will not hear. The "god of this world" has blinded the English State. To the State the Church is no longer, except in antique and obsolete forms and phrases, the National—the true—*the* Church of England. It is merely a sect amongst others—a sect possessed of temporal advantages which others cannot boast,—a sect which is, through its heads, under the sway of the Minister, and which affords him some of his best patronage. In this point of view, its existence is convenient to

the State; otherwise, the State would not care if the Church were to pass away from the face of the earth!

We are speaking of the State in its collective capacity, as guided by a certain policy and principle. STATESMEN there may be and are, who from time to time endeavour to persuade themselves and others that this or that specific act of State policy, in reference to religious questions, is founded on some Christian or philanthropic motive,—who always ridicule the notion of any injury being *intended* to the Church. And they are right. They are not actually hostile to her; they are simply *indifferent*, as politicians. But we must be permitted to look somewhat beyond these specific acts, or the individuals who take part in them, and connect the system which is really working in them, and in which every statesman is sooner or later involved. Look at our *rising* statesmen,—even men who set out in life with high notions of the duty of the State to protect and befriend the Church above all others,—have not all these men in succession been absorbed into the opposite system? Has not Mr. Gladstone been obliged at length openly to avow that his early views are impracticable? The truth is, that no statesman in these days *can* uphold the principles of Church and State, which the Church would fain see recognized. *To do so would be a manifest disqualification for office.* The whole system is vitally and fundamentally changed.

It may be that the reader will not have gone along with us in every expression which we have employed, but we do think it impossible that any man of sober mind and of sufficient information, of whatever party he may be, can fail to admit the substantial truth of what has been stated.

Now, then, let us calmly and soberly survey our position. The State, such as we have described it, holds by the forms of the constitution a power of the most comprehensive and stringent character over all that relates to the Church. In its policy avowedly indifferent in the questions between the Church and all the sects which have separated from it—avowedly and on principle indifferent whether the sects make converts from the Church, or the Church makes converts from the sects—avowedly willing to place all sects and communions on a level with the Church—thus, utterly indifferent to religious creeds, the State nominates the bishops of the Church,—nominates large masses of her clergy,—legislates for the Church in all her concerns, both temporal and spiritual,—and extinguishes all power of spontaneous legislative action and reform in the Church. The Church alone, of all religious communities in England, is absolutely subject to the State; and to a State which avows its indifference, *as a State*,

in all religious questions! And amidst this state of things we have remained passive. Our watchmen have not awakened to the real state of things, but have been soothed by the silvery professions of ministers of state. The very patronage of the Church is employed to keep her in silence and in submission. The ascendancy which it gives to ministers enables them to check and restrain her efforts for freedom. The power of the State is employed to extinguish her synods, and thus cause the very notion of united action in God's cause to die away. Without any spiritual legislature competent to decide controversies as they rise, or to promote improvements and uniformity in practice, the Church becomes the prey of parties and divisions which divert her attention from questions affecting her existence as a Church, and leave her helplessly in the hands of the Minister. Meanwhile blow after blow descends upon her defences; breach after breach is effected; her position daily becomes more contracted; but still she remains passive; for even within her ranks are found those who tell her still to lean upon the Government, and cling fast to it unto the end. We have been kept passive by such means, and yet each day ought to have shown us the hollowness of such advice, or its deep error, in applying obsolete maxims to present dangers. We have not known whither to turn for aid. Our professed political defenders have deserted us one by one. Their voices, once raised in our defence, gradually sank into feeble whispers; and then they sided with the hostile cause. The spoilers, deeming their prey nearly exhausted, are gathering around the Church. The State, her ancient protector, and still her master, stands ready to deliver her into their hands, when they have gained power to demand her sacrifice.

That time may still be far off. The Church has yet remaining gigantic strength and power, when fairly roused; and therefore all her assailants are gradual in their advances, and look to gaining their end by a process of exhaustion rather than by open attacks. Some few years ago they ventured too far in proposing the abolition of Church-rates; but for once they found that they had miscalculated the strength of the Church: they found a united and an indignant Episcopate; and they found the whole population, laity and all, rallying around their Church. The rate-payers would not take the bribe that was offered them. From that moment governments, and the opponents of the Church, have forborne experiments which were likely to end in defeat.

Now then let us take another view of the position of the Church. Suppose that the Church, which has been so long a passive instrument in the hands of the State, seeing herself, we will not say enslaved, but dependent on a State utterly care-

less of her welfare, and on the will of political parties; suppose, we say, this body, now in bondage, by some means or in some way, to become active in the pursuit of those capacities of self-control and self-legislation, which she formerly possessed; suppose her to seek for securities—definite, clear, *bonâ fide* securities, for the appointment of bishops truly worthy of their office—what would be the feeling and position of the parties by whom she is opposed, and of the State?

In the first place, she would be encountered with resistance by the State—i. e. by the Minister of the day and his party, including a certain number of bishops—probably also by other political parties. In this opposition, the Government would, we presume, be backed and supported by many of those classes and denominations of religionists who are opposed to the Church, and by all those who have no religion at all. The Minister would try to raise some cry for the purpose of intimidating weak men. The reason of this opposition would be, first, the jealousy and reluctance of the Minister and of political parties, at any interference with the patronage, and consequently political power, which they possess in connexion with the Church; secondly, the jealousy which the temporal Government always feels at any interference with power of any kind that has once become centralized under the State; and, thirdly, the apprehension of the sects, that if the Church were at liberty to act for herself, she would become too strong for them all, and would recover the ground she has lost.

For these and other reasons any movement of the Church of England to resume the spiritual liberties which she formerly possessed, would be likely to be viewed with disapprobation, both by the Government and by a motley array of its supporters.

As far as the State is concerned, we suppose that any reform in the present system would render it even more indifferent to the Church than it now is; and that such indifference and its possible results might be employed to detach timid men from the cause of the Church, and induce them to leave things as they are.

But in reply to all such anticipations, or any other which may be founded on mere temporal considerations, we must say, that we cannot consent to accept any impediments or difficulties founded on such considerations, as any objections against the discharge of duty to God and His Church. No Christian can have any doubt that it is the duty of the Church to seek in the first place the kingdom of God and His righteousness, and, if necessary, to seek it at the hazard of being deprived of all her earthly possessions. In these days, the only strength of the Church lies in this spirit of simple devotion to her most sacred duty. The Church has no earthly friends: she has put her trust in the "children of

men," and they have failed one by one. She must look in future more singly to the solemn responsibilities entailed by her existence as a Christian society, leaving her temporal fortunes to the care of her Heavenly Protector and Spiritual Head.

But there are some considerations as regards the supposed dangers, which are perhaps not undeserving of consideration. If the Church were strong enough to establish her constitutional liberties in opposition to the will of statesmen, political parties, and her opponents, would she not also be strong enough to protect her temporalities? If she could do the one, we think that she would be far more able to defend her temporal position than she now is. Once free the Church from her present trammels to successive ministries, and she would recover a united Episcopate. She would become an object of respect and even of fear, instead of being an object of contempt. She would hold her natural and rightful position in the country as by far the most numerous and powerful community of professing Christians within it; she would have advocates in Parliament; and if assailed, she might be able to beat back the attempt so effectually as to teach her opponents moderation for the future equal to her own.

Supposing therefore the Church to have actually carried against ministers the recovery of her Christian and constitutional rights, there would not be, in our opinion, much danger of her losing her temporalities, excepting, of course, in the case of a revolution, in which she would suffer with all holders of property. In the ordinary course of events, we think that her temporal prospects would be improved; for as matters are now proceeding, the day *must* come when her temporalities will be invaded, and when she will be without power of resistance.

Such anticipations will probably be treated as absurd by mere politicians. They will ask triumphantly, "Who is seeking the confiscation of Church property in England?" These sage and honest advisers of the Church would argue, that because there is no present cry for the overthrow of the Church, there will be none hereafter! Churchmen will not, we hope, be deceived by the hollow assurances of statesmen. They ought not to forget the unceasing effort of all sects in the empire, backed by the revolutionary faction, and by every successive government, to establish the principle of *religious equality*. That principle is every year more and more distinctly recognized by the Legislature. At the same time, the Legislature asserts its claim and its right to dispose of Church property according to its own judgment. Parliament has already struck off twenty-five per cent. from the Church property in Ireland, and given it to the landlords. It has, by its subsequent legislation, taken almost all of the remaining seventy-

five per cent. to support the poor. It has extinguished the Church-rates in Ireland, and confiscated the property of ten bishopries to make up the deficiency. The literary organs of that Liberalism which has gained permanent ascendancy, declare that "it is puerile to expect that the Roman Catholic body of Ireland will ever permanently acquiesce in seeing the *entire ecclesiastical endowment appropriated exclusively to a small minority of the population*, while the Church of the large majority is wholly unendowed[1]." The measures of the Legislature have left little for the spoiler to take.

There are some persons who would bid us look with indifference at the destruction of the Irish Church. "The case of Ireland," they would say, "is peculiar; it affords no precedent for England." They are greatly mistaken in such views, as they may find hereafter to their cost. If by any conjuncture of events a parliament were returned, which was desirous of interfering in a hostile spirit with the endowments of the Church here, what has been done, and may be done in Ireland, will be unscrupulously quoted by Government and by the other enemies of the Church, as having established the principle of interference with the property of an "*established*" Church, or, rather, the right of disposing of "*national*" property in the manner which the State deems most advisable. If there should ever be the *will* in Parliament to interfere with English Church property in a hostile spirit, there will be precedents and principles to support their proceeding in the case of the "Established Church" in Ireland.

We may be mistaken in our view, but it does seem to us that it were more wise in the Church not to await the day when her enemies may have gained irresistible strength, and when Government will betray her into their hands; but to bestir herself at once to meet the dangers before her, by cautious and judicious organization and action. To depend any longer on the State's support, would be mere dreaming. We do not, we again remind our readers, live in the *seventeenth* century. We must now look only to God, and to ourselves: the State has betrayed us, and is ready to sell us. Care should be taken to divest the movement as much as possible of points on which its enemies might fix for the purpose of exciting popular clamour or angry passions. Partizanship of every kind should be as far as possible avoided, demands should be conceived in a tone of moderation, though firmness, on grounds of justice and Christian truth, on principles which the simplest could understand and feel, and in which almost all the members of the Church will join. Sedulous care should be taken, to guard against the notion of the assump-

[1] Edinburgh Review, Jan. 1848, p. 159.

tion of spiritual power with any view to deprive the laity of their Christian liberties. On them especially, *in all classes of society*, the success of the cause of the Church must very greatly depend; without their zealous support, no progress can be made; and as doubts have been *widely* spread amongst them of the meaning and intentions of the clergy, as if the object were to establish a system of "priestcraft" and dominion over their consciences, we think that Christian policy would suggest a mode of proceeding which would put an end to any such suspicion, by associating the laity, *under due and right restrictions*, with the clergy in the legislature of the Church, and in its local tribunals of discipline. In fact there is nothing alien to the practice of the Church in such union of lay and clerical members in synods. Almost all the synods of Europe, from the seventh to the eleventh century, were of this mixed character, at once Parliaments and Church synods. It is traceable in our own Anglo-Saxon history. It has been adopted in America; and to our mind it seems necessary in the peculiar circumstances of the Church of England, with reference to the independence of the national character, and the suspicions which have been assiduously instilled into the popular mind. A Church legislature fairly representing the laity as well as the clergy, would, in our opinion, possess tenfold influence over one composed of clergy alone. It would be looked to by all the members of the Church as their ecclesiastical representation, as the House of Commons is looked to by the nation at large as its political representation.

The plain and straightforward avowal of such perfectly fair, just, and reasonable objects, as removing the discussion and determination of our doctrine, discipline, and worship, from a parliament including "Jews, Turks, Infidels, and Heretics," to some body consisting of churchmen only, and fairly representing the Church—the acquisition of really efficient securities for the appointment of bishops worthy in all respects of their office, and qualified to carry out its spiritual duties with power and effect—the multiplication of a laborious, working Episcopate, and of the clergy in populous places—these and such as these are objects so reasonable, so incapable of affording just grounds of offence to any sincere member of the Church, that we cannot think there would be danger in advocating them, if the advocacy were temperate, firm, and free from all appearance of party spirit. Let any such movement be conducted with prudence and *perseverance*, and it will continually gain adherents who are at first afraid to join it.

The late controversy on the appointment of Dr. Hampden to the Episcopal see of Hereford, has been the means of awakening public attention to the real position of the Church in connexion

with the State. The opposition to that appointment has been throughout conducted with a temper, moderation, and substantial success, which exceeded all expectation. We cannot of course predict what will be the results upon the mind of the Church at large. But we should think that there are many persons who will be able to look somewhat beyond this particular case—who will look on Dr. Hampden's theories, or Lord John Russell's conduct, as of little moment in comparison with the greater and more momentous questions involved in them. Some, who have been excited by what seemed to them a positive outrage, may be disposed to look on it as an exceptional case, and to relapse into their usual passive dissatisfaction; but there will be, we presume, others, who will turn their thoughts to examine and to reform the whole system with which such acts are connected.

Be this as it may, however, we again express our solemn conviction, that unless the Church becomes organized and active in pursuit of her great practical objects, such as Church-extension, an increase in the Episcopate, and the restoration of a national synod—and unless in so doing she act independently of the State, *not in opposition to it*, but with a distinct object of *influencing* the State, just as all other religious bodies in the country influence it; unless the Church pursues her way steadily to this object, without regarding the promises of statesmen, the timidity and apathy of some of her own members, or even the tacit disapprobation of some of her rulers under State influence, she will be compelled ultimately to relinquish the whole of her temporalities to the State.

Thirty years ago this language and these anticipations might have been deemed extravagant; but can they be called so now? Is it nothing that the State has distinctly taught the doctrine that, as a State, it holds out equal encouragement to all religions? Why does it admit persons of all religions amongst its members? Why does it provide for Jewish, Dissenting, Romish, members of Parliament, and *ministers of the Crown?* why does it thus *identify the Crown itself with indifference to all religion?* If the ministers of the Crown, *by whom alone the royal prerogative is exercised*, may be openly and by legal enactment, Jews, or Dissenters, or Romanists, what principle is there on which to maintain the restriction on the religion of the sovereign? Mark the composition of the House of Commons; and the political influence in English and Scotch boroughs, and in Ireland, gained by the *enemies of the Church as an establishment* within fifteen years. Mark the regular *organization* of all the opponents of the Church, and the perfect harmony with which they hang together (however different their views may be on other points) for carrying measures adverse to

the Church; opposing her wishes, and breaking down her defences. Mark the uniform *success* which attends their efforts; and the uniform neglect experienced by the Church. On one side, the tide is always advancing; on the other, always receding. The one cause is always gaining; the other is losing its place inch by inch. We have seen much lost; we daily see more departing; we cannot tell the hour when the whole will be snatched from us. Religious equality demands it; and the principles of the State are so utterly and hopelessly gone, that *no minister could any longer, except on grounds of expediency*, defend the Church. Let us not be lured into destruction by the language of such advisers as Sir Robert Peel, who would fain convince us, that after all that has happened, we are "stronger than ever." Our strength, such as it is, does not consist in sitting still, depending on the protection of the ministers of the day, and waiting to be sold piecemeal; we *have* strength, weak as we are from divisions, caused by the intermission of synods, and by Government influence over some of our bishops and clergy; still we *have* strength—the strength of the most sacred cause of truth—the strength of duty—the strength, we believe, of the Divine protection which has not left us; though earthly rulers and their partizans have long forsaken our cause. But it behoves us to use that strength while we may; for the decisive conflict is drawing on.

We address ourselves to those who are faithfully and sincerely devoted to the great truths which the Church of England enshrines; those who are detached from the influence of the temporal government, and who can, in simple sincerity, look to the welfare and the preservation of the Church as the chosen instrument of God's grace for the welfare of this kingdom. We address ourselves only to those, with whom the safety of the Church is, next to their own salvation, the central point of their wishes, and their hopes, and their fears. We ask of them to look soberly and calmly upon the real, actual state of things. What prospect has the Church before her? Is she gaining the kind of power which will enable her, *in the Legislature*, to maintain *permanently* her present position? Has not her position been gradually changing? Has she not to look for a rival hierarchy, usurping English titles, evidently expecting more than protection from the State,—a hierarchy which, ere long, will be admitted into high places with its rival titles and dignities? Has she not narrowly escaped the prospect of a papal nuncio residing permanently at the English court, and urging the interests of his communion, by playing on the fears of government through Irish Romanism? And what is the meaning of all this, and of the innumerable measures, actions, concessions, in favour of the

Church's enemies? Churchmen! all this has a mighty meaning. The tendency of the whole is to the destruction of your Church. Statesmen would, in various cases, shrink from such a consummation. They do not, themselves, see whither their movements are tending: they have no *hostility* to the Church: it is an engine of State, which they would rather preserve. But, nevertheless, they are steadily advancing in that current of progress which carries our destruction along with it. They are engaged with the passing struggles of party; and either cannot, or will not, see the certain tendency of the whole.

We have to deal with a Government which holds powers over the Church in ways which are not easily discernible.

When we learnt the lamented death of the late Archbishop of Canterbury, we ventured to form a conjecture as to the *kind* of appointment which ministers would be likely to make, in consequence of this vacancy. We said to ourselves, "The Government is manifestly embarrassed and alarmed to the greatest degree by the recent proceedings in the case of Dr. Hampden. It dreads the commencement of a movement for the purpose of removing from the Ministry the appointment to bishoprics: it knows that disgust at the system of appointing bishops, and the odiously secular motives which always prevail in it, have long been general, not merely amongst those whom it considers to be 'Tractarians,' but amongst large bodies of the clergy *and laity*, most opposed to those views: it has seen, with terror, a real union between men of very different views in the Hampden controversy: *it will therefore endeavour to dissolve this union*,—so threatening to its power,—by appointing to the Episcopal see, which will be vacated by the promotion of one of the most subservient Whig bishops,—a prelate, whose appointment will be so acceptable to *the Evangelical section of the Church, as to be calculated to detach them from any movement which may be made in restoration of the Church's rights.*"

Matters have not happened exactly as we anticipated; for the *primacy* has been filled up on this view, and not the vacant Episcopal see. We sincerely respect the excellent prelate who has been appointed; and, as far as his appointment is concerned, we have reason to congratulate ourselves, when we look on others who *might* have held that seat; but we cannot, for all this, help seeing clearly the ministerial craftiness which has dictated that appointment. Dr. Sumner might have remained at Chester for the remainder of his days, had not the legal proceedings in the case of Dr. Hampden taken place.

The minister has appointed Dr. Sumner, in hopes of preventing a *general* movement of the Church against the corrupt system of

ministerial patronage. The appointment of Dr. Hampden, and the admiration expressed by the premier for *Tillotson*, Arnold, and Archdeacon Hare, is a sufficient proof, that Dr. Sumner's appointment has not arisen from any concurrence with his *theological* views; that it is simply a stroke of State policy. We cannot think so meanly of the sense of religious men, (of whatever school they may be,) as to suppose that they can be deceived by any such appointment as this into the belief that the minister of the present day has any higher notions and views in exercising the patronage of the Crown than his predecessors have had. The very ministry which makes Dr. Sumner archbishop, opens the Legislature to the Jews; has no objection to see Mahommedans and Brahmins legislating for the Church of England; opens communications with the pope; is anxious that the Legislature should recognize him as "sovereign pontiff;" wishes for the residence of a papal nuncio or legate at the court of St. James's; is most desirous of being allowed to establish and endow popery in Ireland, and to govern Ireland through the Romish priesthood; recognizes popish prelates as "lords archbishops and bishops;" aids and supports popery in the colonies; employs all its patronage for the purpose of *exterminating Scriptural education* in Ireland; aids and abets in the removal of all legal penalties, restrictions, or discouragements to the progress of Romanism in England; is willing to aid *Romish* schools in England; permits the appointment of a Romish hierarchy usurping English titles; and, in fine, is leagued with those parties, whether political or religious, whose main object is the destruction of the "Established Church."

We presume, then, that it is sufficiently evident that no partiality for Dr. Sumner's *theological* opinions led to his appointment to the See of Canterbury. The mode in which the See of Chester has been filled up confirms this view. The minister has, in this instance, been careful to nominate a bishop of whom the world has never heard, except as a head of a House at Cambridge. If the object was to make an appointment which was likely to create *no disturbance*, that object has been attained; and the minister at least, if not the Church, will in this instance have profited by experience. But still the worldly system and principle of statesmen remain unchanged.

We say, then, that the Church would be most criminally indifferent to the sacred cause intrusted to her, if she were any longer to "put her trust in princes." In trusting statesmen, she trusts herself to persons influenced by all the uncertain and changeable democratical feeling of the country—to persons who, as regards their *general policy*, have no liberty of action themselves. To trust in *the*

Crown is still more delusive. What powers does the Crown *in itself* now possess? The Crown is *irresponsible* and powerless in itself; its powers have fallen *entirely* into the hands of responsible ministers. It is almost amusing to read, as we continually do, of the anxiety of statesmen to preserve the *prerogative of the Crown!* These gentlemen are very earnest that the *Crown* shall retain without diminution the power of appointing bishops—that the *Crown's* rights shall not be interfered with—that the *Crown* shall be absolute and unrestricted by the laws of God or man in making Episcopal appointments—that the *Crown* shall be at liberty to enter into whatever relations it pleases with the See of Rome! If there be any attempt to secure the appointment of good and holy men as bishops, it is an interference with the *Crown's* prerogative! The *Crown* should be considered *incapable* of appointing bad bishops. It is quite unloyal to imagine such a possibility!

When we remember that by the English constitution, the Ministers are responsible for all exercise of the royal prerogative, and that they are liable to impeachment for *abuse and wrong exercise of that prerogative*—it is plain that the whole outcry which is made by statesmen on the subject of preserving the royal prerogative is, simply, in so many words, a struggle to maintain *their own patronage and powers.* The sophistry is so miserable, that every one can see through it; and not all the oracular sayings of statesmen or field-marshals on this subject, can long prevent the truth from being seen and understood. For ourselves we are disgusted at the perpetual talk of statesmen of all parties about "the royal prerogative;" seeing that their whole language on the subject is founded on fallacies and delusions of the most palpable kind. We have no fancy to see the Minister of the day maintain or enlarge his *own* power under pretence of respect for the Sovereign, whom he at the same time leaves *without power*, and recognizes as little more than the registrar of his acts.

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS, ETC.

1. The Wood Spirit—My Life—Jones's Chartist Lyrics, and Lord Lindsay. 2. Tupper's Hactenus. 3. The Collects in Verse. 4. Elrington's Life of Archbishop Ussher. 5. Allies' Church of England cleared from charge of Schism. 6. Cope and Stretton's Visitatio Infirmorum. 7. Davis's Principles of Nature. 8. Ecclesia Dei. 9. The Duke of Manchester's Finished Mystery. 10. Thornton's Plea for Peasant Proprietors. 11. Froissart's Chronicles. 12. Mrs. Gray's History of Rome. 13. Tales of Adventure. 14. Constance, a Tale. 15. Gatty's Bell. 16. Things after Death. 17. Martineau's What is my Duty? 18. Carleton's Emigrants of Ahadarra. 19. Warren's Now and Then. 20. Humphry's Commentary on the Acts. 21. Hall's Prayers. 22. Surtees on the Ministry of the Word. 23. Salwey's Gospel Hymns. 24. Boyd's England, Rome, and Oxford. 25. James on Passages from the Fathers. 26. Fewell: Opinions for Churchmen. 27. The Cemetery. 28. Hardinge's Election of Grace. 29. Philo-Biblion on the Communion Services. 30. Neale's Stories. 31. Lawson's Sermons. 32. Reeve's Power of Divine Grace. 33. R. Montgomery's Great Salvation. 34. German Tales from Hauff and Tieck, and Beauties of German Literature. 35. Kennaway's Sermons. 36. Sheppard's Christian Obligations of Citizenship. 37. Heygate's Godfrey Davenant. 38. Emily Vernon. 39. Loss and Gain. 40. Grover's Voice from Stonehenge. 41. Bishop of Tasmania's Charge—Viscount Campden's Chaplaincy in Madeira. 42. Baxter's Village Sermons—Newman's Gospel the Power of God. 43. King's Little Red Book. 44. Williams's Gospel Narrative of our Lord's Ministry. 45. Webb's (Mrs.) Beloved Disciple. 46. Nash's Scriptural Idea of Faith. 47. Wakeman's Archæologia Hibernica. 48. Webb's Continental Ecclesiology. 49. Cust's Noctes Dominicæ. 50. Miscellaneous.

1.—1. *The Wood Spirit. A Romance.* In 2 vols. London: Boones.

2. *My Life. A Poem.* Newby.

3. *Chartist Lyrics. By* Ernest Jones. McGowan, Great Windmill-street.

4. *Lord Lindsay. A Poem. By* Ernest Jones, *Esq., Barrister-at-Law.*

All our readers have, no doubt, heard of Chartism; and this subject, ever a serious one, is replete with more solemn interest, now that Democracy is enthroned triumphant in a neighbouring land, and threatens all the monarchies of Europe. It is a sad, but certain truth, that vast masses of our labouring population, some hundreds of thousands in number, are banded together in an association, which professes, for the moment, only to seek for Universal Suffrage, and the centralization of all power in the working classes; but which at the same time demonstrates, through all its organs, its impatient eagerness to overthrow every institution of our country, and create an absolutely despotic democracy on the ruins of individual freedom and imperial greatness.

We cannot for a moment disguise or withhold our opinion, that

no man or men should be entrusted with absolute power; and that it is equally dangerous to place this in an individual, as in the despotism of Russia, or in the one majority of the mass, as in the United States. Liberty, true liberty, and the division of power, we regard as synonymous terms. Our existing constitution secures this division. Public opinion is virtually omnipotent in this country, but its expression is controlled by various highly-important barriers from all national precipitations or other excesses. The working classes or masses have vast power, being directly represented by public meetings, the right of petition, the show of hands at nomination, the press, &c.; indirectly, they are further represented by Crown, Lords, and Commons. The middle classes are directly represented by the Commons; and the higher classes, or aristocracy, by the Lords; the Crown, as the executive, acts for and represents all. Here we have an equilibrium of power, which can never indeed be perfectly maintained, as momentarily Crown, Lords, Commons, or people *must* preponderate in the scale. The observation of this fact has led M. de Lamartine, now at the head of the Republican movement in France, to deny the possible existence of any so-called balance of power; but his remarks on this subject are childish in the extreme, he having altogether failed to observe, that although aristocracy and democracy cannot preponderate at once, the first may be in the ascendancy to-day and the second to-morrow.

But in this projected critical sketch it must not be our task to examine the influences for good and evil of various systems of government. We content ourselves with asserting the infinite superiority, in every point of view, of a division of power, such as is realized in the British constitution, to an absolute democracy, which is fatal to individual freedom; and pass to the consideration of the very remarkable democratic and chartist orator and poet, the titles of some of whose productions we have placed at the head of these remarks. Ernest Jones is now, after Fergus O'Connor, the most popular man in the Chartist movement; he is by far the most brilliant democratic orator this country has ever known, and he is further recognized as the Chartist laureate; the author of "The Purgatory of Suicides," whom some of our readers may remember, having been almost unanimously dethroned to make room for this new monarch. Our readers will probably be surprised to hear that in his own peculiar line Mr. Ernest Jones is positively a true poet; a certain artistic finish, which might be little looked for, distinguishes even his most rabid strains, and the wild imagination displayed in them is only equal to their destructive power. We can conceive such strains working an infinity of mischief amongst our labouring fellow-countrymen; and we have no doubt that the

poet, who is, we understand, both a gentleman and a barrister, despite his democratic frenzy, would receive this acknowledgment on our part as the highest compliment we could possibly pay him. His first publication was a romance, entitled "The Wood Spirit;" replete with the fire of genius, but partially indistinct and misty, both in conception and execution. This was followed by the first part of a poem, entitled "My Life," first published anonymously, but since acknowledged, purporting to be an account given by an aristocrat of his life-long experience within his conventional circles. Some of the satire introduced in this was powerful; but we were especially struck by the pathetic beauty of some passages, which appeared to proclaim that the author had something higher than mob-worship in his soul. In saying this, we mean not to affirm that the people are not capable individually of the noblest sacrifices; nevertheless, the adulation tendered to the working classes by each and all of their self-constituted Chartist leaders, must be revolting to every lover of independence and hater of servile idolatry.

Mr. Jones's last poem, entitled "Lord Lindsay," appears, strange to say, almost aristocratic in its tendencies. The hero is a nobleman of an ancient line, and no little stress is laid on his resolve to maintain his ancestral dignity. Owing to a want of due confidence in his fellows, his cause, and himself, Lindsay fails in life, despite of glorious opportunities of the attainment of happiness and glory, and dies in doubt, and almost in shame. There is nothing democratic here; and though there is great power, vivid and picturesque imagery, mature thought, and lofty purpose, we cannot linger on the contemplation of this remarkable poem, being anxious to pass to the consideration of those democratic lays, which are, after all, most characteristic of this author's aims and powers, and of more pressing import at the present moment, from the alarming aspect of the political world. We would beseech our readers to awaken to the urgency of the hour's demands, and work upon the labouring classes, the masses of this empire, by every means within their power, teaching them to prefer the true individual freedom they at present enjoy, which could not be enhanced by any *political* change whatever, to that democratic despotism, which must almost inevitably terminate in the elevation of some one individual, by the voices of the many, to absolute supremacy.

We do not say that the people should be told it would be unconstitutional or impracticable to extend the suffrage at some period; but they certainly should be made to feel that the possession of the suffrage is in no way essential to the enjoyment of liberty, or even of a due degree of power. We have now nearly

a million electors, out of six millions of operatives, who might be qualified under universal suffrage. France, out of nearly ten millions, had about two hundred thousand; so that the cases of the two countries were in no degree parallel. The five millions in our country, who are not directly represented, may and do exercise a vast influence on public opinion, and consequently on the Legislature; nay, we are prepared to affirm, that no war could be carried on for any length of time to which they were, as a body, opposed. The last great war, as is well known, was generally popular, and therefore was it so long continued, and ultimately so triumphant. Again, the Ten Hours' Bill was carried, entirely owing to the expression of opinion of this class; and were they to unite against the Poor Law in the same way, it is highly probable that that act would not long disgrace a Christian Legislature. The power of the working classes then is virtually great without the suffrage; with the suffrage it would be absolute, and the single despotism of one majority would be substituted for the action and counteraction of democracy, aristocracy, and royalty, all influenced and ultimately controlled by so-called public opinion.

But to the Chartist Lays. We will cite one, or at least the larger part of one, as a sample of the spirit unfortunately prevalent amongst our masses. It is entitled "*Our Warning.*"

"Ye lords of golden argosies,
And prelate, prince, and peer!
And members all of parliament
In rich St. Stephen's,—*hear!*

"We are gathering up through England,
All the bravest and the best,
From the heather-hills of Scotland
To the green Isle of the West;

"From the corn-field and the factory,
To the coal-belt's hollow zone;
From the cellars of the city
To the mountain's quarried stone.

* * * * *

"And, if ye mean it truly,
The storm may yet be laid,
And we will aid you duly,
As brothers brothers aid;

"But if ye falsely play us,
And if ye but possess
The poor daring, to betray us,
Not the courage to redress:

"Then your armies shall be scatter'd
If at us their steel be thrust,
And your fortresses be batter'd
Like atoms into dust!

"*And the anger of the nation*
Across the land shall sweep,
Like a mighty devastation
Of the winds upon the deep."

We shall not extract more. This is amply sufficient to call attention to a movement of a most dangerous order, and to a democratic orator and poet, of whom we may be destined to hear far more than we should wish, at a future day, unless we also buckle on our armour, and appeal to the people's nobler sympathies and better reason. The social battle may yet be won; but it must be fought, and speedily. The people must be taught to love our Church and State; or dread, indeed, will be the consequences. In the approaching war of nations, though England may strive to stand aside, she will be constrained, and that probably very soon, to take an active part. It is her destiny and duty, whilst promoting constitutional liberty, to struggle against democratic despotism; but to do this with any hope of success, she must have a loyal and loving people at home. The English people are naturally conservative, naturally reverential, naturally noble in their impulses, but left to themselves, or rather abandoned to the teachings of eloquent and ardent democrats, (with whom, be it observed, the Romish priesthood almost invariably co-operate!) the eventual result can only be a rebellion and a civil war! The Church is responsible. To the clergy we look for succour in the hour of need. The people may yet be won!

II.—HACTENUS: *Sundry of my Lyrics Hitherto. By* MARTIN F. TUPPER, *author of* "*Proverbial Philosophy*," "*The Crock of Gold.*" London: Hatchards.

THE character of a nation should and must be reflected in its poetry. The gloom, and spleen, and discontent, which exercise, unhappily, too wide an influence over the minds of our countrymen, have found their poetic expression in the works of Byron, where, sublimated and idealized in semblance, they are almost the only genuine sources of inspiration. On the other hand, that cheerful content, that practical wisdom, that genial love and reverence for the good and beautiful, to which our real greatness as a nation must be attributed, has found its literary realization or embodiment, primarily and mainly, in the immortal Shakspeare;

whose world-dramas, as they have been not inaptly designed, are no less wonderful for their power, than for their moral, and indirectly religious, healthfulness. In the present century Southey has been the chief poetical representative of the more healthful and genial attributes of the Anglo-Saxon race; though Scott may perhaps also claim, in his degree, to share this glory with him.

The principal work of Martin Farquhar Tupper, "Proverbial Philosophy," is instinct with this spirit of genial hopeful love; and to this mainly should be attributed the vast amount of sympathetic admiration it has attracted, not only in this country, but also in the United States; where, through many shades of national peculiarity, not especially amiable in our eyes, still beams forth the star of Anglo-Saxon buoyant life. "Proverbial Philosophy" has, indeed, much poetic beauty; we were about to say, independent of this healthful spirit; but we feel the expression would not be justifiable, so inextricably interwoven are the twain. Farquhar Tupper is not only a most genial representative of that happy freshness of heart and soul, which earned for our country the appellation of "merry England" in the olden days; but he is also in his degree a representative of the English Church; distinctively anti-ascetic, but imbued with cheerful, hopeful piety, and the true spirit of catholic forbearance.

We find, indeed, some of the practical errors or shortcomings of our Church only too faithfully reflected in Mr. Tupper's effusions. There is to be discovered, what a great reaction from asceticism but too generally leads to, almost too keen an enjoyment of the happiness of this world, which, "as a shadow, passeth away;" unrelieved by that chastening influence of penitential sorrow, or at least of its remembrance, which should never be wholly absent from any mortal joy; which is as the dew upon the flower, through which, however, the flower but shines the purer. The English Church we hold to be the great witness appointed by Heaven to manifest, in word and deed, that the highest earthly life is not only compatible with, but is only duly realized in, the lawful use of this world; that the duties of the husband, the father, and the active citizen, whether lay or clerical, are spiritually higher, when rightly appreciated, than the self-allotted tasks of the monk and hermit. As the spirit of false asceticism corrupted ancient Christianity, checked, and eventually all but destroyed, European civilization, and, sending the best and wisest and bravest of mankind to selfish seclusion, left the world orphaned to sink beneath a thousand years of barbarism; so was it essential that, prior to the last dread contest betwixt the powers of good and evil, living faith, realizing the sublime verity that "in Christ" all things are

hallowed to the true believer, should seek for and find its embodiment in some great branch of the Church Catholic, which could thus alone be enabled to fight with success against the Pantheistic utopianism of the last days. This we have, and praised be our gracious God for it, in the English Church; but, as of necessity, earthly imperfection will enter with its alloy wherever the ideal is realized in a practical form; and thus we cannot conscientiously acquit the Church of England of tendencies to worldly-mindedness and a too great love of this life. And these tendencies we also suspect at least to be the source of inspiration of some of Mr. Tupper's minor lyrics. There is too much of "joy and gladness," too little of penitential sorrow, in this poet's strains. He appears too anxious to express his conviction, that this world is not only not a vale of tears, but a glorious paradise, to all who will receive it as such. Grief, in his philosophy, appears as the tender shadow cast by happiness, almost refreshing in its stillness and purity. No doubt, there is a sense in which much of this is true: nay, we are ready to admit, that holy joy is in itself a higher thing than holy sorrow; for "perfect love casteth out fear." But, at least until this perfect love is attained to, and it is very questionable whether it ever can be literally and strictly attained in this world, a deep unconsciousness of our own imperfections and sins, and a holy sorrow for them, as well as for those of our brethren, (this latter cause of grief existing indeed even for Christian perfection, could such perfection be realized,) must sway our souls, and prevent our indulging in too bright conceptions or realizations of the existing state of society in the world. We do not think Mr. Tupper has sufficiently remembered this. Nevertheless, we rejoice in the calm and yet blissful content in which his soul appears to dwell; and can well believe that it is not from any want of sympathy with others that life appears so fair a thing to him, but because he has been endowed by nature with a happy temperament, disposed to bask in faith and love, and has found peace for his soul in glad yet humble homage to his Maker.

Closely connected with the error we have above alluded to, the excess of joyfulness, stands that of self-exaltation and excessive confidence, which the most careless reader cannot but recognize in the collection of lyrics entitled "Hactenus," now under our consideration, and which few perhaps would be disposed to treat with as much mildness as ourselves. We believe, however, that Mr. Tupper really feels himself a poet, and therefore in some sense a man raised above his fellows. Very great misconceptions prevail on this subject. It is supposed that the man of genius must be necessarily very humble in the estimation of his own capacities, and

consequently more distrustful of himself than his neighbours. This is by no means the case. No doubt, there are moments at which he will doubt his calling, and frequent occasions when he feels his own insufficiency to realize all his ardent fancy has conceived. Nevertheless, he cannot well be unconscious of his superiority to the herd of men, and no doubt the constant remembrance of his moral weakness or positive sinfulness is requisite to keep down the intellectual pride, which might otherwise elevate him in his own esteem above the level of mankind. It would be absurd to imagine, as some critics have done, that Shakspeare, for instance, was not aware of the greatness of his plays, or preferred his "Venus and Adonis" to them. The assumption of such an error is tantamount to converting the highest intellectual power into a species of inspired idiotcy. But, to resume, Mr. Tupper is not only too openly conscious of the reality of his genius, but has also far too frequently proclaimed it in the little volume now before us. We beg him, for his own sake, as for that of the Christianity he has so nobly vindicated, to be more chary of self-assertions for the future.

The reader who has not seen "Hactenus" may ask for some sample of our author's happiest moods. They shall have it in what many might consider a strange subject for a poem, "The Early Gallop," replete with healthful genius, and fire, and Christian exultation, and altogether most characteristic of this fortunately joyous poet. This little lyric is, in our estimation, worth a thousand common-place sentimentalities; it sends a thrill of cheerful vitality to the sympathizing heart, and of itself demonstrates, and perhaps vindicates, the special mission of its author. We would entreat Mr. Tupper, if possible, to cultivate the vein in which this effusion was composed, and we can promise him the increasing sympathy and admiration of his fellow-countrymen, if he thus progresses.

THE EARLY GALLOP.

(*Written in the saddle, on the crown of my hat.*)

At five on a dewy morning,
Before the blazing day,
To be up and off on a high-mettled horse,
Over the hills away,—
To drink the rich sweet breath of the gorse,
And bathe in the breeze of the Downs;
Ha! man, if you can, match bliss like this
In all the joys of towns!

With glad and grateful tongue to join
The lark at his matin hymn,
And thence on faith's own wing to spring
And sing with cherubim!
To pray from a deep and tender heart,
With all things praying anew,—
The birds and the bees, and the whispering trees,
And heather bedropt with dew,—
To be one with those early worshippers,
And pour the pæan too!

Then off again with a slacken'd rein,
And a bounding heart within,
To dash at a gallop over the plain,
Health's golden cup to win!
This, this is the race for gain and grace,
Richer than vases and crowns;
And you that boast your pleasures the most,
Amid the steam of towns,
Come, taste true bliss in a morning like this,
Galloping over the Downs!

We have many favourite poems amongst the collection before us, but will content ourselves with specifying "Farley Heath," which is couched in the same genial strain, and has the same marked originality, both of conception and execution.

Every reader must feel at once that none but an Englishman could have achieved the little poem we have just transcribed, and, we think we may add, none but a Christian. Mr. Tupper has yet a noble future before him. In beseeching him, despite all critical admonitions and remonstrances, to follow out his own fresh impulses, we believe that we pursue the course most advantageous to the poet and the public. The serious sonnets in the collection before us have merits, but are not equal to the more characteristic strains above alluded to. Various stanzas for music we cannot at all approve of: they appear to us to be merely written to task. We would have Mr. Tupper a little less self-confident, and yet as buoyant and cheerful as ever: a little more humble, and yet displaying no mock-modesty. It may seem hard to realize apparent contradictions, yet we are sure Mr. Tupper has it in his power to attain such an end. But, as he is, the author of "Proverbial Philosophy" may well command our respect and sympathy. He is a valorous fellow-combatant with us in the cause of Christianity, and therefore of right and truth; and amongst her laity, it would not be very easy to discover a more valuable member of our Church than Martin Farquhar Tupper.

III.—*The Collects for the Sundays and Holydays throughout the Year, in the order in which they occur in the Book of Common Prayer, rendered into Verse.* London, 1848.

The author of this neat little volume, whose modesty has prevented him from prefixing his name to a performance which could only redound to his credit, has accomplished, in a most happy manner, a task at once novel, and by no means easy. The title-page sufficiently explains its nature; we have, therefore, only to speak of the mode of its execution. If simplicity of diction, faithful adherence to the thoughts, and for the most part to the very words of our beautiful Liturgy, combined with a purity of versification, and a correct poetical ear, are recommendations in an attempt of this kind, the little volume before us is certainly entitled to its fair meed of praise. The poet takes his inspiration from the Prayer Book, and renders its strains of devotion in a series of stanzas which, though necessarily differing in merit, are on the whole very beautiful, and singularly appropriate for the object which the author had in view, that of familiarizing texts for liturgic anthems. We give as a specimen one or two stanzas which happen to catch our eye as we turn over the leaves.

THE PURIFICATION OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY.

Almighty God, we humbly pray,
That, as thy blessed Son this day
Was to Thy holy temple brought,
In substance of our flesh, so taught,
We, in like wise, may there be seen,
With thoughts more pure, and hearts more clean.
By the same Jesus Christ, Thy Son,
With Thee, and with the Spirit One. Amen.

ST. MATTHIAS'S DAY.

O God, by whose o'erruling grace,
Faithful Matthias did the place
Of traitor Judas fill;
Grant Thou unto Thy Church, to be
From false Apostles ever free,
And to be order'd unto Thee
By faithful pastors still,
Through Jesus Christ, Thine only Son,
With Thee and with the Spirit One. Amen.

We shall be happy to see, as the preface leads us to hope, some skilful composers of church music taking up the subject, with a view to make this poetic paraphrase of our Collects available for congregational purposes. In the mean time the little work may serve as a pleasing addition to domestic worship.

IV.—*The Life of the Most Rev. James Ussher, D.D., Lord Archbishop of Armagh, &c. By* C. R. Elrington, *D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Dublin.* Dublin: Hodges and Smith. London: Parker.

This volume deserves a far more extended notice than our present space permits us to offer. To all who are interested in the past state of the Church of Ireland this memoir of Archbishop Ussher will be extremely acceptable, entering as it does with faithfulness and accuracy into the details of the eventful period during which its illustrious subject's life was protracted. We have, in fact, within the compass of this single volume the history of the Church of Ireland from the reign of Elizabeth till the accession of Charles II. The state of things which it discloses is deeply painful, more especially as evidencing the hateful system of sacrilege and corruption which was permitted to mar the work of the Reformation in Ireland. Archbishop Ussher, with all his learning and great merits, yet sat still amidst corruptions and abuses which ought to have induced him to resign his see rather than consent to them. If persons in the position of Archbishop Ussher could not or would not move boldly for the reform of abuses, who could wonder at the irregular attempts of Puritans and others to purge the sanctuary of its corruptions? The heads of the Church, in abdicating their functions when they are called for by the highest necessities of religion, virtually hand them over for the time to inferior agents.

V.—*The Church of England cleared from the charge of Schism, &c. By* T. W. Allies, *M.A., &c. Second Edition.* Oxford: Parker.

We have on a former occasion borne testimony to the learning which Mr. Allies has brought to bear upon the great question in controversy between England and Rome. We have now to thank him for a revised and enlarged edition of his volume, which bids fair to become a standard work, and which we strongly and unreservedly commend to our readers as comprising a great range of sound argument and well-digested learning. The ease with which Mr. Allies has demolished the arguments of Mr. Thompson, a recent convert to Romanism, who had attempted to reply to his work, is almost amusing. We do not think that Mr. Allies will find any further attempts to answer his work. It is one of those works, in its present state, which Romanists are usually in the habit of *forgetting to notice.*

VI.—*Visitatio Infirmorum; or, Offices for the Clergy in Praying with, Directing, and Comforting the Sick, Infirm, and Afflicted. By* W. H. Cope, *M.A., &c., and* H. Stretton, *M.A., &c.* London: Masters.

This is, without exception, the most valuable work, as a companion for the parochial clergy in their important and difficult duty of visiting the sick, that it has ever been our fortune to meet with. It supplies indeed a want which has been long felt,—the want of a book framed on the model and in the spirit of our office for the Visitation of the Sick, carrying out the design of the Church into all those details and varieties of cases which present themselves in the course of pastoral duty.

The work contains a great variety of offices for cases not expressly provided for in the Prayer Book. It enables the clergyman to combine instruction and variety with suitable devotions; and it is replete with practical suggestions which will be found eminently valuable to the young clergyman, conceived as they are in accordance with the spirit of the English Church, and with a careful regard to her guidance.

VII.—*The Principles of Nature, her Divine Revelations and a Voice to Mankind. By and through* Andrew Jackson Davis, *the "Poughkeepsie Seer," and "Clairvoyant."* In 2 vols. London: Chapman.

"The Poughkeepsie Seer" possesses, if we may judge from his portrait prefixed to these volumes, a highly-intellectual exterior; but we confess, that with all the agreeable impressions produced by pale brow, black hair, good eyes, well-tied neckcloth, &c. &c., we were not exactly prepared to find Mr. Andrew Jackson Davis presented to us literally and simply as a Prophet, fully qualified to correct all the mistakes into which Moses and the Apostles have fallen! The volumes before us purport to be a new revelation, in which the defects of the present revelation, more especially as regards the botany, geology, and physiology of the sun, moon, and planetary system, are supplied; and the history of the creation of this world and of man is fully cleared up. Mr. Chapman, the publisher of this highly curious affair, while announcing himself a philosopher and liberal (in religious matters) of the first water, shrinks from the positive assertion of his *belief* in the Divine inspiration of the volumes, as they are "full of errors;" but suggests the very ingenious theory of their proceeding from some beings of an inferior order, but superior to man, who are

liable to make occasional *mistakes!* This is a saving clause somewhat needed by our "Poughkeepsie Seer;" and we highly commend the ingenuity of a gentleman who, by this clever expedient, avoids the apparent absurdity of rejecting the Divine authority of the Apostles and Evangelists, while he accepts that of a "Clairvoyant."

There seems at present rather a "hitch" in the whole matter, from the fact that the witnesses who attest the circumstance of this work proceeding really and simply from the "Poughkeepsie Seer" in a state of clairvoyance, and without subsequent retouching by his friends, are Americans, whose names are "unknown in this country." This, however, does not prevent the publisher from printing a *stereotype* edition of the work, in the hope that sufficient evidence will be afforded in a *future edition!*

We must enlighten the reader a little as to the inhabitants of the *planets* with whom we here become acquainted for the first time. In these descriptions we find a want of variety. The inhabitants appear to be invariably two-legged animals, with no more than one head. This is far too common-place.

We extract the following description of the men of Saturn:—

"The following class in order, of animal organization, is the ultimate of this planet, and the perfection of all below it; and this class is MAN. His form is perfected in its developments and adaptations to its uses. His limbs are very straight and round. His joints and their appendages are composed of *fine materials*, and display in their perfect adaptation *original design*. . . . . The sternum is oval and full, joining the costals with a kind of brace-work, which gives full space and free action to the viscera system. The lungs, which are divided into two hemispheres, are composed of an adipose and elastic, active substance," &c.—Vol. i. p. 180.

Now for the human inhabitants of Jupiter:—

"Their form is full, and well sustained by inward and physical powers. Their size, symmetry, and beauty of form, exceed those of the earth's inhabitants. Their mental organization corresponds to their physical developments. Smoothness and evenness are apparent upon their form generally."

It is to be regretted that these fine men "assume an inclined position, frequently using their hands and arms in walking," from "a *modest* desire to be seen only in an inclined position!" We wonder what the inhabitants of Saturn, who are always looking through their telescopes at what is going on, think of these inhabitants of Jupiter. If risibility constitutes any part of their "moral and intellectual development," we should imagine

that it is immoderately excited whenever their telescopes are turned in the direction of Jupiter.

These profound lucubrations form the prologue to a new theory of creation, in which the human being is agreeably and naturally developed through the successive stages of zoophyte, cod-fish, donkey, and ouran-outang; while the philosophic mind is taught to expatiate over the field of sacred history, expunging such facts as may be fairly considered as "awkward" ones, and resolving all the rest by the aid of natural philosophy and clairvoyance. Thus the reader is landed at length in the dominions of rationalism and infidelity, an object for which alone we believe the book was written and published. As to the whole story of "Clairvoyance," we do not believe a word of it. The book is simply a rationalistic one, got up in a somewhat imposing form, in the hopes of gaining attention. Its pedantry is absolutely insufferable, and its controversial tone most offensive.

VIII.—*Ecclesia Dei: a Vision of the Church. With a Preface, Notes, and Illustrations.* London: Longmans.

This volume may be described as a satire upon the Church of England generally. Its ability, pungency, and bitterness, are of no common order. To judge from the professions of the author, he belongs to the extreme party who followed the doctrines of Messrs. Ward and Oakley before their secession; and the writer is apparently bent on taking vengeance for the measures which furnished to those unhappy persons a pretext for their separation. All parties in the Church are unmercifully lashed: the Bishop of Exeter more especially is the subject of the author's vituperation. We do not mean to deny, however, that there are good "hits" in this poem: some parts are clever and amusing, though personal to a degree almost exceeding the bounds of legitimate satire. We extract the following lines in reference to Sir James Graham's notions of Episcopal duties:—

> "Again, I say, what wonder is there, when
> Bishops be such, that such are meaner men?
> That such be bishops—what? when they who make
> Bishops, such notions of a bishop take
> As Graham voided erewhile in the House—
> Graham, Rat Robert's most consentient mouse;
> Who deems, he says, from living proofs, that all
> A bishop has to do is nought withal,
> But once in each three years to come and lay
> His hand on little boys, and go his way,
> And for another three enjoy his pay;

His palace, dinners, clubs, and rents enjoy,
Sans interruption, hindrance, or annoy,
From parish priest, or little girl or boy!
Save that of such year's ember-days some twain
He needs must choose, whereon Church clerks t' ordain.
And this beside no further charge hath he
On time or purse for hospitality;
To him for rede or rule no brother goes;
He sees few rectors, not a curate knows.
A prelate he, to lordly post preferr'd,
They but th' ignoble 'working clergy' herd;
And if they really must communicate
With him as touching church or parish state,
A penny pays the half-ounce letter's weight!"

We have been often tempted to smile in perusing these pages, but we have done so with something of a feeling of self-reproof.

IX.—*The Finished Mystery. To which is added, an Examination of Mr. Brown on the Second Advent. By* GEORGE, DUKE OF MANCHESTER. London: Hatchards.

WHATEVER may be the actual weight attached to the Duke of Manchester's arguments on the deeply interesting and awful topics which he handles in this work, it is impossible to refrain from an expression of strong gratification and pleasure in witnessing the homage thus offered to those sacred writings, on which the faith of the greatest and the humblest of Christians must alike repose. The spirit in which the distinguished author engages in his task is really worthy of the subject. Rarely have we seen more candour, moderation, and Christian charity displayed in any argument. The views of the author are opposed to Millenarian theories, and are in favour of our Lord's personal reign on *earth*, which he supposes will be *eternal*.

X.—*A Plea for Peasant Proprietors, with the Outline for their Establishment in Ireland. By* WILLIAM THOMAS THORNTON. London: Murray.

THIS is one of the most striking volumes on questions connected with political and social economy that we have seen for a long time. The prejudice, if it is to be considered such, in favour of large farms is almost universal amongst landlords; and it strikes us that if Mr. Thornton had directed his labours more to show to landlords that their pecuniary interest would be bene-

fitted by the system of small farms than he has actually done, his success might be more probable than it seems at present. The facts which he has collected in his work as evincing the superior comfort and respectability of a peasant proprietary to that of a mere labouring population, is most striking. He remarks, that the system of consolidating farms began in England in the latter part of the fifteenth century, and to it he ascribes the great distress and vagrancy which led ultimately to the Poor Law of Elizabeth. At the period referred to,—

"Pasturage," says Mr. Thornton, "began to be regarded as a more profitable employment of land than tillage; and in order to afford room for its adoption on a sufficiently extensive scale, many farm-houses and cottages were pulled down, and the fields belonging to several were sown with grass, and let to a single tenant. Not only were 'tenancies for years, lives, and at will, whereupon most of the yeomanry lived, turned into demesnes' (Bacon's Hen. vii Works, vol. v. p. 61) in this manner, but freeholders also were ejected from their lands by force or fraud, or were harassed or cajoled into a sale of them (More's Utopia, pp. 32—34) . . . But almost immediately after the consolidation of small farms commenced, legislation took a different turn, and Parliament, instead of striving to curtail the labourer's honest earnings, had to exercise its ingenuity in providing for a rapidly increasing crowd of destitute."

Acts of Parliament on this subject were passed in 1487, 1494, and 1535; and the Poor Law of 1601 was the sequel.

One remark falls from Mr. Thornton in reference to the consolidation of small farms, which bears so directly on a subject of considerable importance, that we do not hesitate to solicit for it the reader's particular attention.

"Most writers on the subject (the Poor Laws) have attributed the growth of pauperism, at the period in question, to the dissolution of monasteries by Henry VIII.; but this opinion seems to be refuted by the single fact, that monasteries were not abolished till 1535, *many years after the continual increase of vagrancy had become a standing topic of parliamentary lamentation.*"—p. 83.

Mr. Thornton's account of the present state of the peasant proprietary in France and Jersey, is highly interesting. Do not his arguments tend towards the abolition of the law of Primogeniture? However this may be, we commend Mr. Thornton's work to the especial attention of all who are interested in the very important subjects to which it relates. His remarks on the colonization of waste lands in Ireland deserve the attentive consideration of the Legislature.

XI.—*The Chroniclers of England, France, Spain, &c. By Sir* JOHN FROISSART. *A New Edition, condensed, with Notes and Illustrations.* In 2 vols. London: Burns.

WE are glad to see Froissart brought more within reach of the general reader by this neat publication. It is well got up, as all Mr. Burns' books are, and we do not see any thing which should prevent it from finding a place in the library of a Churchman, though of course Mr. Burns's recent change of faith renders us rather suspicious in general of his publications.

XII.—*History of Rome for Young Persons. By Mrs.* HAMILTON GRAY. In 2 vols. London: Hatchards.

THE fame which Mrs. Hamilton Gray has acquired by her preceding publications on the History and Antiquities of Etruria, affords ample security for accuracy and learning in her treatment of the subject of her present labours. The history is carried at present only to the end of the Roman Republic. It is written in a very pleasing style, and abounds in wood-cuts, representing, for the most part, the dwellings, coins, utensils, and weapons of the Romans.

XIII.—*Tales of Adventure by Sea and Land.* London: Burns.

AN amusing and interesting collection of adventures, rather poorly illustrated by wood engravings.

XIV.—*Constance; a Tale. Addressed to the Daughters of England. By the Author of "Recantation."* London: Rivingtons.

THE object of this little work is to point out to English women the danger and evil of contracting alliances with foreigners, and the infinite hazard which they run of sacrificing either their faith or their domestic happiness. This is beautifully and most strikingly depicted in the life of the Princess de Monte, one of the characters in this very beautiful tale. We have derived the highest pleasure from the perusal of the little volume now before us, which appears to us very far superior in all respects to "Recantation." The writer has in "Constance" produced a tale which, in point of pathetic and touching interest, has rarely been surpassed, or even equalled. The death-bed of Murray, and the whole circumstances attending it, are, in our opinion, most admirably conceived and executed. We recommend the work with unmixed gratification to our readers.

xv.—*The Bell: its Origin, History, and Use. By the Rev.* Alfred Gatty, *M.A., Vicar of Ecclesfield.* London: Bell.

This little essay, on the origin, history, and uses of bells, is calculated, we think, to be useful in rural parishes where there is any interest on the subject of bell-ringing. The author does not attempt to lecture bell-ringers, but he mingles useful and agreeable instruction with his historical remarks. There is a playfulness of tone throughout, which reminds us of Dickens.

xvi.—*Things after Death. Three Chapters on the Intermediate State; with Thoughts on Family Burying-places, and Hints for Epitaphs in Country Churchyards.* London: Rivingtons.

A most pleasing and excellent little work. Its especial value consists in the numerous epitaphs in verse which it supplies. These are arranged under the following heads:—"Labouring classes and poor—Children—Early deaths, sudden, lingering, accidental—Widowhood—Sickly, poor, insane—Husbandmen, broken fortunes—Wives and mothers—Servants, &c.—Miscellaneous—Sundry worldly callings." Very many of these epitaphs strike us as most felicitous in language and conception.

xvii.—*What is my Duty? Edited by the Rev.* Arthur Martineau, *M.A., Vicar of Whitkirk.* London: Hamilton, Adams, and Co.

This little work, as we are informed by the editor in his preface, arose from a correspondence between friends on the subject of the calamitous winter of 1846-7, in which it was suggested that the only remedy, under Providence, was, that every man should do "his duty" in his appointed station. Hence sprang a series of essays, contributed by different friends, which are here presented in a collective form. They touch on our duty to God, to our family, dependents, the poor, neighbours, our country, &c. The portraiture which is in these various essays presented to the view of the Christian is all that could be wished. We should be resting at ease as to the prospects of this Church and nation, if we could see any approximation towards the accomplishment of what this book so piously and wisely urges,—the faithful discharge of *duty* by every individual in his own station: and no small measure of gratitude is due to individuals like Mr. Martineau, who have such implicit confidence in the force of truth as to anticipate good from the publication of essays like these.

XVIII.—*The Emigrants of Ahadarra. By* W. CARLETON. London: Simms and M'Intire.

MR. CARLETON'S abilities in depicting the Irish character in all its strangely-mingled features, have been long recognized by the public voice. The work now before us forms one of the volumes of a very cheap publication, entitled the "Parlour Library," and is sold at the price of one shilling, though in extent of matter it approaches to the dimensions of an ordinary three-volume novel. We think that Mr. Carleton will, in the "Emigrants of Ahadarra," have added materially to the fame which he has already acquired. The object of the tale is to show the evils which result in Ireland from the neglect of their tenantry by the landlords, and the too great confidence which they repose in their agents. We are fully aware that agents will sometimes be rogues and tyrants, and that they have much in their power; but this evil is not peculiar to Ireland; it must exist in all parts of the world where there is a landed aristocracy; and we have no reason to suppose that the resident landlords of Ireland are more neglectful of their tenantry than landlords elsewhere. "The Emigrants of Ahadarra" is, however, a tale of most powerful interest, abounding in pictures of Irish life and manners, chiefly in the labouring and farming classes. The "squireen" Hycy Burke is ably sketched, and the ferocity of the gang with which he connects himself in the illicit manufacture of whiskey—the hedge-schoolmaster, with his pedantry and wit—the ardent devotion of Kathleen to her country and religion—the honest and warm-hearted family, who are at length driven to the verge of ruin, and thence recover in a way so little anticipated—these, mingled with a thousand wild adventures, render the tale before us one of the most effective, in our opinion, that has ever proceeded from Mr. Carleton's pen. Whoever wishes to see Ireland depicted with almost fearful truthfulness, will possess himself at once of this most interesting volume.

XIX.—*Now and Then. By* SAMUEL WARREN, *F.R.S., author of "Ten Thousand a Year."* London: Blackwood.

To those who have read "Ten Thousand a Year,"—and who has not?—no advice need be offered on the subject of reading the present work. It will be read, of course, by every one who can get hold of it. We are not about to write a regular critique on this work, for, to say the truth, we feel little inclined to point out defects where there is so much of which we must strongly approve. We are aware that Mr. Warren will have offended the somewhat

fastidious taste of a large class of readers by the unreservedness of his reference to religion as the foundation of his own hopes, and the leading principle which actuates some of the principal characters in his work. It will doubtless appear to some persons as overstrained and unnatural, and they will look on it as little more than "cant." But, while we do not defend every expression or sentiment which may have been employed by Mr. Warren in reference to these subjects, and do not attempt to determine whether in every case they are weighed in the nicest scales of theological criticism, we yet cannot but feel, as we peruse his work, that throughout there is a tribute paid to the Gospel of Jesus Christ, as the great support of all that is generous, noble, and beautiful in human actions; and for this, and the tendency of the work throughout to attract the affections towards that definite form of religion in which we believe the most precious treasures of Christian truth are enshrined, we cannot but express no ordinary measure of gratitude.

The character of the clergyman, Mr. Hylton, is a noble conception; and his exertions to obtain the pardon of his parishioner, who had been condemned for murder, are of almost breathless interest. Throughout the volume, indeed, but more especially as the catastrophe approaches, the excitement is intense. We could point out many blemishes in this work, if we could bring ourselves to do so at any length. The whole character of the earl appears to us overdrawn and strained. The conversation and manners of the noble family, of which he is the head, appears to us to be devoid of the refinement and grace which ought to have mingled with their passions. The whole strikes us as rather "low-lived" amidst all its power. There is, indeed, throughout the volume, more of energy than of refinement or grace. We scarcely know which to admire the most, the Christian benevolence of Mr. Hylton, or the almost sublime faith and patience of Adam Ayliffe. The most touching scene in the book, perhaps, is the reconciliation of that venerable patriarch and of the aged earl, and their reception of the sacrament at the same altar.

xx.—*A Commentary on the Book of the Acts of the Apostles. By the Rev.* W. G. Humphry, *M.A., &c.* London: J. W. Parker.

This commentary on the Acts of the Apostles embodies a selection from the critical and exegetical commentators of Germany, combined with observations of the ancient Fathers, and of modern English divines. From what we have seen of it, it appears to reflect credit on the learning and assiduity of the compiler.

XXI.—*Prayers for the Use of Families, to which are added others for Private Devotion. By the Rev.* W. J. HALL, *M.A., &c. Second Edition.* London: Rivingtons.

THE reader will not find in these prayers any extravagant addresses or rapturous devotion. We confess that we think a little more warmth would not have done them any harm. But they are a plain, sober, and sound-minded collection of prayers; and we have no doubt that they will suit the religious temperament of a very large class.

XXII.—*A Treatise on the Ministry of the Word. By the Rev.* SCOTT F. SURTEES. London: Hatchards.

THE Rev. Scott Surtees would seem to have no want of confidence in his own theological powers, in attempting to settle the chief questions affecting the Christian ministry, in a tract of sixty-eight pages. According to this gentleman's views, the prophets, and not the priests, were the standing ministry amongst the Jews, and Christian ministers succeed the prophets, and not the priests. How far this latter position will exempt Mr. Surtees from the imputation of seeking to uphold the authority and privileges of the Clergy we do not distinctly see. It would seem to *us* that the authority of successors of the *prophets* would be still greater than that of successors of the priests, as regards the office of *teaching*. The controversial tone of this tract is most offensive.

XXIII.—*Gospel Hymns. By the Rev.* T. SALWEY, *B.D., &c.* London: Hatchards.

THESE poems, written by the author during a temporary retirement from professional duty, rendered necessary by ill health, are intended for the use of parents who adopt the plan of a systematic course of reading the Gospels with the children or pupils. The subject of each hymn is taken from the chapters of the Evangelists in succession; so that there are as many hymns as chapters in that portion of Scripture. The collection does not pretend to any very high poetical merit; but it is not unsuitable, as far as we can judge, for the purpose for which it was intended.

XXIV.—*England, Rome, and Oxford, compared as to certain Doctrine, in Six Lectures. By the Rev.* ARCHIBALD BOYD, *M.A.* London: Seeleys.

MR. BOYD'S publication refers chiefly to controversies which have, in great measure, passed by. It is directed against the

peculiar tenets of "Tractarianism," more especially against any exaggerated view of the authority of the early Christian writers; against Mr. Newman's doctrine of justification; the doctrine of reserve, development, &c. As far as we can judge, Mr. Boyd is a sound and able writer, on the whole; and he does not appear to be one of those persons who are driven by reaction into extremes of doctrine, contrary to those against which he is contending. There is very much in Mr. Boyd's work which every Churchman must peruse with pleasure.

XXV.—*Thoughts on Passages selected from the Fathers. By the Rev.* J. B. JAMES, *B.A.* London: Rivingtons.

A COLLECTION of short passages from the writings of the Fathers, with meditations on each. We cannot say much for this well-meant attempt.

XXVI.—*Fewell; a Series of Essays of Opinions for Churchmen. By* W. A. Baltimore: Joseph Robinson.

THIS volume is designed chiefly to point out the defects of the systems of Religionism so lamentably prevalent in America, and to contrast them with the Church. It is, in fact, an informal and controversial defence of the Church and her principles, and we have no doubt that it is admirably adapted for its purpose in America. The author evidently understands perfectly well the leading points of the American character, and, amongst other matters, dwells at some length on the "*Expense* of Disunion."

"Let us enter," he says, "any one of the ten thousand villages of our country, say one having from five hundred to a thousand inhabitants; what is the state of religion there? If Christians were united, there would be one large church in the village, of Church-like architecture, &c.

"We look, then, at the actual condition of Christianity in such a village, and we find four or five, sometimes eight or ten, distinct societies. The old-established Presbyterian or Episcopal, the Baptist, the Methodist, and others. Four or five houses of worship, half or quarter filled, where there might be one well attended; four or five societies struggling for existence, where one could live decently and easily; four or five ministers half-starved, where one could get a respectable support. And round about this fragmentary Christianity a flood of 'non-professors' constantly increasing in numbers, not immoral, or evil, or wicked, but the main body of them good, industrious, moral men, who, from their steadiness and sobriety, would be an honour to any denomination. Indeed, I have heard it remarked that wickedness

and craft and little meanness of dealing, are far more likely to be found among 'professors,' and high and honourable feelings among 'non-professors.' These men are kept in actual heathenism by the disunion among Christians, and its consequences daily before their eyes, and by nothing else.

"And in the mean time the supporters of each society in the village have to pay four times as much as they would do were all united; nay, I believe that a man worth fifty thousand dollars has often to contribute more, than he who is worth that amount in land has to do under the tithe system in England; a great deal more than he does there who is worth so much in money. The three or four miserable struggling societies pay more than would keep up one flourishing society. They pay far more than this; being a minority they pay for the majority. For religion being a universal benefit all should contribute to its support, and all would do so willingly and readily were religion one. But these folks having by their separations originated the class of 'non-professors,' and deprived them in their infancy and adult years of the great blessing of holy Baptism, are, by the providence of God, compelled to pay for them also. This extra payment also becomes a means of increasing the number of 'non-professors.' For them there is actually a premium upon irreligion."

XXVII.—*The Cemetery; a brief Appeal to the Feelings of Society in behalf of Extra-mural Burial.* London: Pickering. 1848.

Our readers would not imagine from the title that this little brochure is a poem; such, however, is the case,—and a poem well worthy of attention too. It has great faults of rhythm and diction, but displays at the time undoubted power; some of the passages are really very fine: and there is an utter scorn of the mannerism of the day, which leads us to treat gently even the faults in the opposite direction. We can imagine the author deeply read in the *real* poets of England, especially Cowley, Dryden, and Pope; and viewing with contempt the superficial polish of the times we live in. He combines with much of the power and concentration of these writers, many of the defects of the first of them. We advise him to pay a little more attention to ease of diction and fluency of rhythm—he is, we think, a diamond, but a *very* rough one. The following passages are fair samples of the author's power:

> "Shouldering the babe—a parent in her woe,—
> The girl of five her plaything must forego.
> Full soon a sterner case successive weans,
> And household drudgery o'ertakes the teens.
> The bride of toil, the spouse of hunger's curse,
> Want's teeming mother, misery's sickening nurse,

Too soon absorb'd, too prematurely past,
Each age another thrusts, and death the last.
Life's crowded canvass spreads to forty's ken,
The full-length dotage of threescore and ten.

* * * * *

Hark! creaks the mattock on a coffin lid,
And earth gives up her injured dead unbid.
Wrought loose as mole-hill 'neath th' oft ent'ring tools,
Each opening grave a banquet meet for Ghoules,
Bids yawn in livid heaps the quarried flesh.
The plague-swoln charnel spreads its taint afresh,
A womb of death, not yet effete with bane:
But every victim draws a lengthening train.
Death with such widely-wasting sickle sweeps,
Man scarce can house the harvest as he reaps.
Then as Archytas' boon is turn'd the crust,
Where human strata graduate to dust;
In foul accumulation, tier on tier,
Each due instalment of the pauper bier,
Crush'd in dense-pack'd corruption there they dwell
'Mongst earthly rags of shroud and splinter'd shell.
A quagmire of old bones, where, darkly bred,
The slimy life is busy with the dead.
Reeks from that bloated earth miasma's breath,
The full-fed taint of undigested death;
Thence, like the fumes from sleeping glutton's throat,
The noisome vapours off her surfeit float.
A grisly rampart mounds the wid'ning cave,
Fresh from death's mine, the fossils of the grave;
And coldly falls the sacrilegious day
On features whence a face hath pass'd away.
Deform'd in death, unmingled yet with dust,
In random haste, as once beneath it thrust,
Forms, like the livid shades that throng the dream
Of guilt, dark dregs of memory's awful stream,
And seem to stare and commune o'er his lot,
With eyes that light not, lips that whisper not.
Corroding clods by human shape yet shared,
Only more loathsome made by what is spared,
They tumble up piecemeal along the mould,
And still decay some relic will unfold:
As from that offal of the tomb we turn,
Some trait which pleads for pity bids us yearn.
Hireling, profaner, hold, some mercy feel!
And will he hear humanity's appeal?
Ah—no; on lineaments the worm had left,
The mangling spade hath gash'd a hideous cleft.
But, see, earth closes o'er another head,
And one more sleeper crowds that narrow bed."

XXVIII.—*A Practical Exposition of the Election of Grace, in Four Sermons. By the Rev. Sir* CHARLES HARDINGE, *Bart.* Tunbridge: printed by W. Budyer, bookseller, &c. 1847.

THESE are simple and earnest discourses, published by their author for a charitable purpose. The following passage, and the note appended to it, arrested our attention, as we glanced over these pages.

"Say not, then, that they who 'perish through the deceivableness of their own righteousness,' were doomed and predestined to this wretched end: for rest assured of this, that every man has his day or period of grace; but if he neglect the merciful invitation, and prefer to it the gains and pleasures of an evil world, whom has he just cause to reproach but himself? If he despise and grieve the Spirit of God, by hardening his own heart, can he be surprised if its gentle and persuasive influence should be withdrawn? or should he fancifully expect a *sensible* communication from the Spirit of God, can he complain if he be left to the vain delusions of his own mind, and the evil suggestions of the tempter[1]?"

XXIX.—*The Communion Services Considered. By* PHILO-BIBLION. London: John W. Parker, West Strand. 1847.

THE writer of this very prosy little book has shown great good taste in concealing his name: we can scarcely, however, attribute his doing so to any feeling of modesty or humility, if we are to judge from the pages before us. Some happy chance induced him to adopt an incognito: let him preserve it, by all means. But why has he chosen the singularly inelegant mask which appears on the title-page? It reminds us of THE BRIXTON OIKON, an equally scholarlike conception, which some years since adorned the front of a shop on Brixton Hill.

XXX.—*Stories from Heathen Mythology and Greek History for the use of Christian Children. By the Rev.* J. M. NEALE, *M.A.* London: Masters. 1847.

THESE stories are so well told, the language is so appropriate, and the moral so admirably introduced, that it is scarcely too much to say that they are perfect, both in design and execution.

"[1] This observation is founded on matter of fact. A man whom I knew in this parish, on being seriously warned of the evil consequences of an ill-spent life, offered the following singular cause for his conduct:—'If I am in the number of the elect, I shall experience a call from God; I shall therefore wait till He thinks proper to call me by His Spirit to a state of salvation.' I need scarcely warn you against the spiritual delusion likely to spring from such weak and mistaken notions of the nature and efficacy of divine grace."

XXXI.—*Plain and Practical Sermons. By the Rev.* G. N. GRAY LAWSON, *M.A., of St. John's College, Cambridge, and Incumbent of Dilton's Marsh.* London: Masters, &c. 1847.

THESE sermons appear fully to realize their title; and whilst giving their due place to the doctrines of the ever-blessed atonement and justification by faith, carefully, but unobtrusively, to inculcate those other important points which are too often hoisted as the signals for civil war.

XXXII.—*The Power of Divine Grace. A Sermon, preached on the occasion of the Death of the Rev.* J. T. NOTTEDGE, *Rector of St. Clement's and St. Helen's, Ipswich. By the Rev.* J. W. REEVE, *Incumbent of Holy Trinity.* Ipswich: Hunt. London: Simpkin and Marshall; and Seeleys. 1847.

IT gives us peculiar pleasure when we are enabled to bestow high commendation on the works or lives of those whom the unhappy divisions of our Church separate from us. And we are strongly of opinion that the devotional reading of works which convey lessons of divine truth, dressed in phraseology to which we are unaccustomed, has a tendency not only to open our hearts towards our brethren, but to make our own internal religion more real, by disconnecting it from those conventional terms which too often supply the place of the holy things which they denote in the minds of zealous but shallow devotees. We strongly, therefore, recommend the sermon before us, as describing in all earnestness, truth, and humility, the inner life of one of God's real saints; and we feel rejoiced that the writer has not throughout the whole of his discourse cast one single reflection on, or made one ungenerous allusion to, any of those from whom he so widely differs. Would that we could all follow the example set us in the following sentences:—

"He had much largeness of spirit; embracing cordially for Christ's sake all 'who loved the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity.' He saw through, and above, and beyond those differences which separate so many; and although there was no want of distinctness in his own views and principles, yet he acknowledged what was of Christ in *any* man, and received it heartily."

XXXIII.—*The Great Salvation, and our sin in neglecting it. A Religious Essay, in Three Parts. By the Rev.* ROBERT MONTGOMERY, *M.A., Oxon.* London: Hatchards. 1846.

THIS is a very able, a very eloquent, and a very excellent work, though disfigured here and there by that extraordinary phrase-

ology which too frequently appears in the writings of this author.

What, for instance, can look more odd than this put as one of the headings in capitals,—

"ALLOW NOT THE CREEDLESS APATHIES OF THE INTELLECTUAL TO ALARM YOU."—p. 312.

and yet the passage which follows is most excellent; on the other hand, what can be finer than this—

". . . We warn you all, that if you dare to 'neglect the great salvation,' no tongue can express, no heart conceive, and no imagination predict, the doom you will incur. Remember, oh! remember, we entreat you as a dying man who speaks to his dying fellows; the question we have discussed is indeed put by Scripture, but *it is not answered*, and never will be, now or hereafter; 'How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation?' If we summon our reason to answer, it is dumb; if we supplicate our conscience to reply, it is mute; if we demand of the law, it is silent; if we invoke the Gospel, it is speechless; Creation cannot respond to it; Providence is alike unable; neither from the heights of Heaven, the abyss of Hell, nor the broad circumference of our human world, comes there any reply to this vast question.

"*How* shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation? Nay, more; if in imagination we take our stand upon the dark brink of time, and ring the challenge over the terrific boundlessness of eternity to come, it rolls back upon the ear of our shuddering consciousness, and echoes,—'How?'"—p. 365.

The following expression, which caught our eye whilst looking for the *first* quotation, is striking:—

"THE IDOLATROUS CULTURE OF UNCONVERTED MIND."—p. 64.

Nor have we ever met with any thing more forcible than this,—

"Base worshippers of mammon, such as these, do not show common mercy to their own souls; how then can we expect that they will compassionate the spiritual wants of those whom they employ!"—p. 369.

XXXIV.—1. *Select Popular Tales, from the German of Wilhelm Hauff.* London: Burns.

2. *Select Tales and Romances, from the German of Ludwig Tieck.* London: Burns.

3. *Beauties of German Literature, selected from various Authors; with short Biographical Notices.* London: Burns. 1847.

THESE are all extremely well worth reading, and admirably got up. Hauff's tales are quite delightful, even when most won-

derful: there is an ease and nature about them that makes the reader fancy he might have himself borne part in them; the tone too is healthy throughout. Tieck's tales are of a very different order,—wild, strange, unnatural, yet with a power and a depth of thought and feeling, and a more than human energy of description, that enchains the attention and captivates the mind. "The Reconciliation," however, and "The Love Charm," are far inferior to the rest. In the latter, the character of Æmilius is such as to lead us to suspect that his surname (which the author conceals) must be "Moddle." "The Beauties of German Literature" are well chosen, well translated, and superior to the other two volumes in getting up. They consist of five tales, by Hoffman, Richter, Pichler, Zschokke, and Tieck; each of them selected so as to show in bold relief the peculiar excellences of the author; there is consequently great variety in them. The biographical notices are well done.

XXXV.—*Sermons preached at Brighton. By the Rev.* C. E. KENNAWAY, *M.A. Second Series.* London: Rivingtons. 1847.

THOSE who are acquainted with the first volume of Mr. Kennaway's Brighton Sermons will expect to find in this volume many deep thoughts and much practical teaching, nor will they be disappointed: on the contrary, they will find all the merits of the first series in a higher degree of perfection, without those faults which frequently detract from our pleasure and profit in reading the earlier volume. There is greater simplicity, both of thought and diction, as well as a decidedly more unfettered development of mental and spiritual power, in these sermons than in their predecessors. Both clergy and laity may read them with advantage in their studies, or to their families. They possess great merit, both literary and religious.

XXXVI.—*The Christian Obligations of Citizenship; a Discourse. By the Rev.* JOHN SHEPPARD, *M.A., Fellow of Wadham College, Oxford, and Second Master of Repton School.* London: Rivingtons. 1847.

THIS is a work of great power, inculcating the identity in origin and analogy in practice of all moral laws of action. The writer ably shows, that though distinct in their visible developments, all the subordinate motives of the Christian's conduct as a creature, a man, and a citizen, have but one fountain-head in the principle of love, which, descending from the Deity to the indivi-

dual, ascends again to its Author, and thence reflects itself on His whole creation.

The book is calculated to do great service by combating the popular error, that the code of political morality is alien from and independent of that of Christian duty; and even those who are not inclined to go along with the author in all his views, may derive much pleasure, as well as profit, from a careful perusal of these pages. They abound with deep reasoning, noble sentiment, and passages of grave eloquence. Take, for example, the following:—

"It is in vain for Luxury to proclaim to the children of Want, 'Thus far shall ye come, and no further: your blood be upon your own head: if you multiply, you perish.' *This* is not Christian humanity. The answer is, 'We are your own creation. It is your pampered habits and artificial wants that have multiplied us, like rank vegetation, in every nook and corner of this already crowded island. It is the insatiable thirst for wealth that has spread us through your towns and fields; that has bid us increase like the beasts of burden, that we may labour in your manufactories; that has taught society to number men as 'hands,' and not as immortal souls. And now you shall not cast us off. You may call us the 'many-headed monster;' but, like Frankenstein, you have yourselves called up the monster into life, and you are doomed to be its slaves. Support us, or *you* perish.' Such is the social phenomenon at which we have arrived: no longer dimly pictured on the page of history, or faintly echoed down by the voice of popular tradition, but standing in all its gigantic evil beside our footsteps and around our homes. Woe to us unless we deal with it at once; and deal with it in a different spirit from that which animated the past. What was the crying sin of Jerusalem? The iniquity which was also 'the iniquity of her sister Sodom: pride, fulness of bread, and abundance of idleness, was in her and her daughters; neither did she strengthen the hand of the poor and needy.' Who can assert that a similar spirit has not prevailed among ourselves? Witness the horrible revelations of the parliamentary commission; the mercenary madness that forgot our ancient and self-ennobling reverence for the helplessness of sex, and the innocence of youth; the deep degradation of our poor but Christian brethren, 'the smoke of whose torment goes up' from our coal-pits and manufacturing towns. This state of things cannot subsist any longer without fearful guilt, and fearful danger too."—pp. 277—279.

XXXVII.—*Godfrey Davenant; a Tale of School Life. By the Rev.* W. E. HEYGATE, *M.A., Author of Probatio Clerica, &c.* London: Masters, &c. 1847.

THIS is an admirable little work, conveying sound principles in a pleasing form and a Christian spirit: high Church and low

Church, clergy and laity, fathers and mothers, masters and children, should read and study it; for it is calculated to do them all great good.

xxxviii.—*Emily Vernon; or, Self-sacrifice.* London: Hamilton, Adams, and Co.

The title of this volume indicates the moral of the tale,—the duty and the sublimity of self-sacrifice in the service of God. The conception of the character of Emily Vernon, who, amidst a long series of afflictions and trials of the most severe description, is continually acting on the principle of sacrificing herself for the good of others, is very noble and touching. We recommend this tale to our young readers, and to their parents; and though we feel that a model is here presented, which few indeed can expect in any degree to approach to in practice, still we trust that its contemplation will excite some longings for the higher walk of Christian duty. The tale is simply told. In some places the author has (probably to avoid diffuseness) in some degree impaired the effectiveness of his tale, by passing too rapidly over some of its more important facts.

xxxix.—*Loss and Gain.* London: Burns.

This is evidently a production of one of the recent Oxford converts to Romanism. It bears undeniable marks of its origin in the extreme familiarity which it betrays with Oxford life and manners; and it abounds in all the phraseology and the ideas which were the distinctive characteristics of the coterie. As to its views and arguments, it may be described as "Ward's Ideal," thrown into the shape of a long-winded tale. There is nothing of novelty in the affair. It narrates the history of an Oxford undergraduate, and the various conflicting influences to which he became subject, until at length the poor youth became bewildered, and sought refuge from his doubts in becoming a Romanist. We confess to some impatience of spirit in wading through pages which have so little of novelty or present interest to recommend them. We apprehend that few readers will be found now who will feel particularly curious to enter into all the details of matters which are so utterly gone by as all that relates to the proceedings of the late Ward and Oakley confraternity.

XL.—*A Voice from Stonehenge. By the Rev.* H. M. GROVER, *Rector of Hitcham, Bucks. Part I.* London: Cleaver.

THE work before us is an attempt to gather from the ancient traditions and legends of various nations some notion of the original colonization of Great Britain. It is thrown into a shape which relieves in a considerable degree the tedium generally attendant on mere antiquarian discussions. We are bound to give Mr. Grover high credit for the ingenuity of his argument, and for the research he has brought to bear upon it; but it cannot be expected that readers will generally go along with the author in his views. Important links are sometimes wanting; and it strikes us that the argument, from the mere similarity of a few words in one language to another, is pressed too far. Mr. Grover's theory is, that Stonehenge was built by the Phœnicians, and that England was peopled by a colony from the north of Africa. He even finds the ancestors of the Welsh somewhere among the Hottentots, we believe. The work is certainly a curious, and in many parts a very amusing one.

XLI.—1. *A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Tasmania*, 1846. *By* FRANCIS-RUSSELL, *Lord Bishop of Tasmania.* London: Rivingtons.

2. *The British Chaplaincy in Madeira. By Viscount* CAMPDEN. *Reprinted, with additions, from "The Theologian and Ecclesiastic" for November*, 1847. London: Cleaver.

WE have brought these two publications together as bearing on the condition of the Church in the Colonies, and its relation to the State. The Bishop of Tasmania's charge is in every respect most excellent; but its especial interest and importance consists in the account which it gives of the extraordinary attempt of the secretary of the Colonies (Lord Stanley) to create an ecclesiastical organization in Tasmania, which would have wholly set aside the episcopal authority as regarded a large proportion of the clergy,—an attempt to which we regret to add that the late amiable and facile prelate who occupied the primacy of the English Church permitted himself to become a party. We cannot sufficiently express our admiration of the firm and intrepid conduct of the Bishop of Tasmania in opposing a measure thus pressed forward by the Primate, the Colonial Secretary, and with the co-operation of his own archdeacon. Throughout the affair he was without the support of his metropolitan, and had nothing but the justice of his cause to maintain him. At great inconvenience and expense this most conscientious and high-principled

prelate crossed the ocean, and has obtained from the present Secretary for the Colonies the abolition of the obnoxious regulations. It appears that the Colonial Government, however, persist in retaining in their employment two clergymen whose notoriously bad conduct has been condemned by the Bishop, and from whom he has withdrawn his licence. Opposition, also, is offered to the institution of any ecclesiastical court for the punishment of offenders against the laws of God and of the Church. In fact, it seems that the Government is anxious to retain all matters of jurisdiction and discipline in its own hands, and to reduce the Bishop to the narrowest possible limits in the exercise of his office. How strange this policy is, when contrasted with the willingness exhibited by the Colonial Government to give the freest and fullest scope to the authority of the Romish Church.

We now come to the interesting publication of Viscount Campden. The Church is indebted to this young nobleman for a full and accurate view of the proceedings of the Secretary for Foreign Affairs in regard to the British Chaplaincy at Madeira. Mr. Lowe, the chaplain, gave offence to a small part of his congregation by the use of certain ritual observances, which, on being represented to the Bishop of London (whose licence he held), were, for the most part, approved by that prelate. Mr. Lowe evinced his desire for peace by relinquishing the remainder; but this did not satisfy the disturbers of the Church; and they proceeded to adopt all kinds of proceedings of the most vexatious kind, such as refusing to accommodate visiters in the chapel, withdrawing Mr. Lowe's salary and allowances, and persisting in making complaints of him. This factious minority, headed by the consul, consisted in great part of open dissenters from the Church, Romanists, &c. Possessing influence with the Foreign Office, this body of schismatics induced Lord Palmerston to appoint another chaplain in place of Mr. Lowe; and the result is, that the latter clergyman retains the episcopal licence and the majority of the people who have adhered to him; a new chaplain has been appointed by the Foreign Secretary in opposition to the authority of the Bishop; and this diplomatic functionary declares, that in future he will not seek for the licence of *any bishop* in making appointments to foreign chaplaincies. We presume that this is a state of things which the Church cannot permit to exist any longer without protest. The whole furnishes another curious exemplification of the disposition of statesmen to bear down the authority of bishops whenever they have the power to do so. We are glad that the subject is being brought before Parliament. Cases of this kind should not be passed over, or they will be repeated.

XLII.—1. *Village Sermons. By the Rev.* ARTHUR G. BAXTER, *Rector of Hampreston, Dorset.* London: Rivingtons.

2. *The Gospel of Christ the Power of God unto Salvation: exemplified in the Preaching and Writings of the Apostle Paul. In Twelve Illustrations. By the Rev.* W. A. NEWMAN, *M.A., &c.* London: Hamilton, Adams, and Co.

WE notice these publications together, because, although the second is not professedly a volume of sermons, it is substantially and really so. Mr. Baxter's account of his volume of sermons is very modest and unassuming. "They are," he says, "but village sermons, adapted to a congregation composed, with but few exceptions, of persons but little able, either from education or the habitual exercise of the intellectual powers, to grasp or to appreciate the abstract theories of contending schools, or the more abstruse doctrines of the Christian scheme." Even with this limitation, we apprehend that sermons such as these are adapted to more than mere "village" congregations; for how few congregations in England can appreciate the abstract theories of contending schools, or abstruse doctrines. We have been very much pleased by all we have seen of Mr. Baxter's sermons. They are, in our opinion, rather too short, even for village congregations; but they are written with a practical piety, a knowledge of the subject, and a grace of style and diction which render them very pleasing in the perusal, and which, we have no doubt, made them highly interesting and effective when preached. As far as we can observe, their doctrine is sound and healthy; but we do not quite concur with the author in thinking them adapted especially to village congregations. Their language is, perhaps, in many places rather above the *very* imperfect comprehension of English which our poor possess.

Of the second publication in our list we cannot say much. It will be, doubtless, gratifying to the author's friends to possess a memorial of his teaching on his leaving England for an appointment in the Colonies; but under other circumstances we cannot conceive the object in publishing what is so very common-place, and yet so laboured.

XLIII.—*The Little Red Book; or, the History of the Holy Catholic Church in Ireland. By* GEORGE KING, *A.B., &c.* Dublin: McGlashan.

MR. KING, whose "Primer of the Church History of Ireland" is probably known to many of our readers as a work of real merit,

has in this little book given a very condensed summary of his larger work, designed for the use of national schools, and written in a style adapted to the comprehension of children. We hope it may obtain a large circulation in schools.

XLIV.—*The Gospel Narrative of our Lord's Ministry (The Second Year) Harmonized: with Reflections. By the Rev.* ISAAC WILLIAMS, *B.D., &c.* London: Rivingtons.

To those who are acquainted with the former portion of this work, and generally with Mr. Williams's writings, there can be no need of saying a word on the volume before us. This work bids fair to be one of our most valuable commentaries, abounding as it does in the choicest thoughts of the early Fathers, and in spiritual and practical applications of texts distinguished for their beauty and originality. We feel assured, from what we have seen of it, that it will ere long find a place in most clerical libraries.

XLV.—*The Beloved Disciple. Reflections on the History of St. John. By Mrs.* J. B. WEBB, *Author of "Naomi," &c.* London: Hatchards.

THIS is one of those works which possesses something better than talent or originality, which it cannot lay claim to. Mrs. Webb has written just the sort of quiet, practical, serious book, which would be adapted for reading aloud in a religious family. It possesses sufficient interest to engage the attention, and it is not so profound as to weary it. We are glad to see books of this class: they are of much use in their way. We do not say that we exactly concur in all Mrs. Webb's views, or that we look on her work as faultless in theology, but we do not think that the defects which there are, are calculated to prevent the practical utility of the work, as a plain, practical, and devotional manual.

XLVI.—*The Scriptural Idea of Faith, &c. By* F. H. NASH, *A.M., Curate of Agher, Diocese of Meath.* Dublin: Grant and Bolton. London: Rivingtons.

A VERY thoughtful and able essay on the various meanings and applications of the term "Faith" in Holy Scripture, and on the doctrines connected with that term.

XLVII.—*Archæologia Hibernica. A Hand Book of Irish Antiquities, &c. By* W. F. WAKEMAN. Dublin: McGlashan.

THIS little volume, profusely enriched with illustrations on wood, is written by a pupil of Dr. Petrie, and is well deserving the attention of all lovers of ecclesiastical and general architecture. The series of its subjects extends from Druidism to the latest remains of mediæval architecture in Ireland. This little book ought to take its place with "the Glossary of Architecture" in every library. It is very curious and interesting.

XLVIII.—*Sketches of Continental Ecclesiology. By the Rev.* BENJAMIN WEBB, *M.A., &c.* London: Masters.

THIS volume will be a very acceptable gift to all who are interested in the study of ecclesiastical architecture. Mr. Webb's observations extend to Belgium, the Rhenish Provinces, Frankfort on the Maine, Bavaria, Baden and Wurtemburg, Tyrol, Lombardy, Tuscany, Lucca, Genoa, Piedmont, the Papal States, and Switzerland. The description of so many churches, in all parts of Europe, by so able an ecclesiologist as Mr. Webb, is a valuable addition to our stock of knowledge. The work is not illustrated by engravings.

XLIX.—*Noctes Dominicæ, or Sunday Night Reading, &c. By the Hon. Sir* EDWARD CUST. London: Rivingtons.

THE late period at which we have received this volume must excuse a very short notice. The object of the work is to aid heads of families who are desirous of promoting the religious instruction of their households on Sunday evenings. The readings are arranged in accordance with the services of the Church; and we have been favourably impressed by their devotional tone, and the knowledge of scripture which they evince.

L.—MISCELLANEOUS.

WE are glad to see a third edition of Mr. Montgomery's work, "The Scottish Church and the English Schismatics" (Masters). This work ought in itself to be sufficient to set the question at rest. We are ashamed to think that any professing members of the English Church should have so far forgotten their duty to that Church, as to separate from the communion of those whom she has always recognized as the legitimate Bishops of Scotland.

A curious antiquarian pamphlet by Archdeacon Williams, in proof that Claudia, mentioned in the Epistles, was a British princess, is deserving of notice. "An Essay on the Constitution of Society," (Hall,) is a pamphlet full of revolutionary principles, grounded on the doctrine of St. Simon and Fourrier. It asserts the right of the people to rise in insurrection against their governors, and denies the existence of any lawful titles to land. The rest of its doctrines are in accordance with these views, which are dogmatically and argumentatively put forth. We have seen with pain "the Report of the Standing Committee of the Chamber of Commerce, Jamaica" (Cowie, 31, Poultry). The West Indian Colonies have been ruined by the intermeddling of the English Parliament. "An Inaugural Address delivered by Edward Masson, Esq., Professor of Ecclesiastical Greek in the College of the General Assembly of the Irish Presbyterian Church," (Belfast,) is an able and interesting production. It strongly recommends Patristic studies to the Presbyterian Students of Divinity. This is as it should be.

"The Gainsaying of Core," by the Rev. W. B. Barter, (Rivingtons,) is a sound and able refutation of Schism. "Plain Lectures on the Holy Communion," by the Rev. Pelham Maitland, are not apparently deserving of particular remark.

We need not, of course, recommend Dr. Mill's Letter on Dr. Hampden's Writings (Masters). It is most clear and convincing; as is also Mr. Irons' Letter to Dr. Hampden (Masters). "An Epitome of the Bampton Lectures" of Dr. H. (Masters) appears also to be carefully drawn up.

The Rev. Dr. Lyon, rector of Bishop's Caundle, Dorset, has published a series of three Discourses before the University of Cambridge (Hatchards) on the moral power of the Christian, which seem to be most usefully and earnestly written.

Amongst single sermons we may mention, as deserving of commendation, one by the Rev. T. W. Peile, D.D., Master of Repton School, in aid of the fund for the erection of St. Alkmond's church, Derby; a Sermon by the Rev. T. N. Harper, B.A., Lecturer of Bideford, on behalf of the National Schools; a Sermon on "the Spirit of Romanism," by the Rev. G. Nugee, M.A., Curate of St. Paul's, Knightsbridge; and most excellent Discourses, by the Rev. C. C. Bartholomew, on his appointment to the parish of St. David's, Exeter; and by the Rev. Dr. Wordsworth, on "Righteousness exalteth a Nation." We should be indeed highly blest, if the statesmen of this country were under the influence of such principles as Dr. Wordsworth has put forth in this truly Christian warning.

A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the East Riding by Arch-

deacon Wilberforce, (Murray,) contains much valuable matter on the subject of an increase in the Episcopate, to which, as well as to the Rev. J. Lockhart Ross's recent publication on "the Reciprocal Obligations of the Church and the Civil Power," (Parker, Oxford,) we hope to direct particular attention in our next number.

We have read with great interest Bishop Doane's Address on the Ends and Objects of Burlington College. We trust that the appeal for aid to this admirable institution will be successful.

Of periodical publications we may mention "The Ecclesiologist," No. IV., (Rivingtons,) as an excellent number of a very useful publication; Mr. Boutell's "Monumental Brasses," publishing in monthly numbers, and well executed. Sharpe's Magazine continues to be ably edited. We have seen with pleasure Wertheim's very cheap and well got up "Bible Cartoons," for the school and cottage.

The Rev. W. Downes Willis has published a spirited and high-principled pamphlet on the Education question, entitled "Outlines of Proposal for the Adjustment of the Education Question," &c.

An excellent little book by Sir A. Edmonstone, "On the Observance of Lent," (Cleaver,) may be recommended as written on the soundest principles.

Foreign and Colonial Intelligence.

Canada.—*Diocese of Toronto.*—The following particulars are taken from an interesting volume just published by the *Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts*, under the title "Annals of the Diocese of Toronto." The number of churchmen in the diocese, which was estimated in 1842, somewhat too low, it is thought, at 100,000, amounted, according to the Bishop's computation, in 1847 to 200,000, out of an European population of 600,000. That population is increasing with wonderful rapidity, not only by natural augmentation, but by the constant stream of emigration from the mother country, chiefly from Ireland. The rate at which this latter cause of increase operates, may be judged of by an authentic statement, derived from a parliamentary paper, comprising both Upper and Lower Canada, according to which the number of emigrants which arrived in that country was,

In 1841	28,280
" 1842	44,692
" 1843	21,807
" 1844	20,245
" 1845	25,515
" 1846	33,025
" 1847	77,000

The number of clergymen in the diocese, which at the Bishop's visitation in 1843 amounted to 103, had risen to 118, when the Bishop held his next visitation in the years 1845 and 1846; and a diocesan clergy list, given in an appendix, and made up to the latest date, gives it at 127. The classification of that list presents the following data:—

The Bishop	1
Archdeacons	2
Rectors	50
Ministers of Churches not being Rectories	7
Assistant Ministers	4
Military Chaplains	6
Missionaries	41
Travelling Missionaries	11
Professors	3
Superannuated	3
Not described	4
	132

From this number, however, five must be deducted, in consequence of four rectories and one missionary station being held conjointly with a military chaplaincy.

The insufficiency of this number of clergy in proportion to the population is apparent, even on an average calculation; but is in reality much more grievous, owing to the scattered condition of that population. "The diocese," says the Bishop, in a letter dated March 23, 1847, "is supposed now to contain 600,000 inhabitants, of whom it is believed that one-third at least, or 200,000, scattered, indeed, through all the townships, belong, or are favourable, to the Church, and *we are losing many of them*, because we cannot extend our ministrations. . . .

"There are two districts, Victoria, containing twelve townships, and Ottawa, containing ten, with only one clergyman in each. The Wellington district is still worse, for it contains twenty-seven townships, and has only one resident minister, and one travelling missionary. In the Huron district there are only three clergymen for twenty-one townships. In short, out of three hundred and fifty organized townships, into which the province is at present divided, there are two hundred and thirty-seven, or more than two-thirds of the whole diocese, with no resident clergyman, while it is computed that a clergyman might find ample employment in each, and in many of them the services of three or four are required."

In his charge, delivered in June, 1847, the Bishop gives the following summary of his visitation: "Since our last meeting in June, 1844, I have visited every mission in the diocese. Not having included Woodstock, Blenheim, Wilmot, Stratford, and Zorra in my former visitation, I held confirmations in them respectively, soon after we separated, and found them, and more particularly the first, namely, Woodstock, of great promise. In the summer of 1845 I visited the districts west of Toronto, as far as Manetouahneng Island, Lake Huron, and returned by the way of Owen's Sound. In the summer of 1846 I travelled through the districts of Niagara, Simcoe, and the Home, and all those east of Toronto. The time occupied, and the continuous and great intensity of the heat in 1846, were rather beyond my strength, and warned me of the necessity of dividing the diocese into three parts, instead of two, an arrangement which becomes the more requisite, from the extraordinary increase of missions and stations at which my visits are desired. During my first visitations in 1840 and 1841, I confirmed at 74 stations, scattered over an immense surface; in 1842 and 1843 they had increased to 102, and in 1845 and 1846 to 197. . . .

"The number confirmed in the course of my recent visitation was 4358, which only exceeded the former by 659. This may be considered a less increase than might have been expected from the rapid growth of our population from immigration and natural causes. It is, however, necessary to remember, that the number of grown-up and elderly persons who came forward during my first confirmation journeys, has greatly diminished, and that the candidates now more generally consist of young persons."

A table is subjoined, exhibiting the rapid expansion of the Church by a comparison of the results of the visitations in 1843 with those held in 1845 and 1846:

	Number of Stations or Parishes in 1843; *in* 1845-6.		*Number of Persons confirmed in* 1843; *in* 1845-6.		*Number of Churches consecrated in* 1843; *in* 1845-6.	
District West of Toronto, including Lake Huron	24	70	756	1212	2	6
Niagara District	16	21	374	354	2	3
Home and Simcoe Districts..	16	35	460	773	3	4
Districts between Toronto and Kingston	20	41	1053	907	—	3
Districts below Kingston	26	30	1056	1112	2	—
Totals ...	102	197	3699	4358	9	16

The happy progress which, notwithstanding the inadequate supply of labourers, is manifest in the Church of Upper Canada, is attributable, under God's blessing, to the interest excited among the Church people of the diocese by the operations of the Church Society, instituted at the suggestion of the Bishop on the 28th of April, 1841. Besides gifts of land for Church endowment to the amount of upwards of 10,000 acres, which were made over to the Society during the first year of its existence, the following sums were received in money subscriptions during the last four years:

In 1844	£1800
„ 1845	2735
„ 1846	3004
„ 1847	2777

These contributions are independent of what is raised by the branch associations for the special benefit of their several districts; and that such contributions are by no means inconsiderable, is proved by the fact that since the year 1839 seventy-eight churches have been built, and several are now building, while many others have been repaired and enlarged. "Our people," says the Bishop in the charge already adverted to, "are every where more sensible of the duty of giving of their substance towards the permanent support of religion." A plan is in contemplation for securing to the Church in each township a few acres of land, which, though of little present value, may hereafter become a competent endowment for three or four clergymen, in each of those divisions. Even at present, eight travelling missionaries are maintained from local resources, while funds have been raised for the maintenance of nearly as many more, as soon as duly qualified candidates are found.

We shall conclude our extracts from this interesting publication by transcribing the following passages from an address to the *Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts*, agreed upon by the

bishop and clergy of the diocese of Toronto, assembled in visitation, June 6, 1847:—

"Amongst our number are many who owe their maintenance as ministers of Christ's Church in this colony almost exclusively to your bounty; and there are but few of the sacred edifices in which we are privileged to minister, towards the erection of which aid has not been received from your Society. To your fostering care, indeed, we would ascribe, under God, much of the prosperity which our diocese now enjoys. In a colony such as Canada, where the great majority of the inhabitants are too poor to procure for themselves the means of grace, the extension of the Church would, humanly speaking, have been a matter almost of impossibility, had we not been favoured with the aid which you have so liberally afforded us.

"We feel convinced that it must prove highly gratifying to your venerable Society to learn, that as our population increases, and the resources of the colony are augmented, the people are making, we trust, correspondent exertions to extend the ministrations of our holy Church, though we fear *the time is yet far distant when our utmost exertions*, aided as we hope they will be by the continued liberality of your Society, will be sufficient adequately to relieve the spiritual destitution which still so greatly prevails in this large and important dependency of the British empire.

"The emigrants also from the mother country, who annually find their way in great numbers to this colony, are steadily presenting demands upon the exertions of the Church, more extensive than our utmost local exertions can supply; and the combination of what your venerable Society so generously contributes, with the voluntary efforts of Churchmen in this diocese, and the largest revenue that can be anticipated from our share of the Clergy Reserves property, can hardly be expected to suffice even to meet the more pressing claims for the ministrations of the Church, without affording the hope that it can be fully and effectually planted amongst us."

France.—*Democratic Demonstrations of the French Episcopate.*—Not the least remarkable among the various features which characterize the recent revolution in France, is the hearty readiness with which the French Episcopate at once saluted the republic, and proclaimed aloud the principles of the democracy as those which not only have the fullest and most cordial approbation of their Church, but which have been, as the Archbishop of Paris hesitates not to affirm, the principles of "the Catholic Church" from the beginning. Considering that this is the first important occasion on which the late declaration of the Papacy through the organ of Father Ventura[1] was practically put to the test, the attitude assumed, and the tone taken by the Romish Bishops in France, and that almost unanimously, notwithstanding the suddenness of the emergency, which precluded them from concerting their measures, is a

[1] See English Review, vol. viii. pp. 249, 250.

most striking and significant fact; proving that there was more than mere oratory suited to the occasion, in the intimation of the famous ex-Jesuit and Theatine, that the Church was about to "turn towards the democracy, baptize that wild matron, and Christianize her." A few extracts from the official documents, in the form of pastorals, containing these manifestations, will be read with interest, and deserve to be permanently placed on record.

As early as Thursday, the 24th of February, the Archbishop of PARIS testified his hearty good-will towards the revolution by the following circular, addressed to the *curés* of the capital:—

"MONSIEUR LE CURÉ,—Our first impulse, in presence of the great event which has just been enacted in the capital, was to weep for the fate of the victims whom death has struck down in so unforeseen a manner; we weep for them all, because they are our brethren; we weep for them, because we have once more experienced how great are the disinterestedness, the respect for property, and how generous the sentiments which animate the people of Paris.

"We must not rest content with shedding tears: we shall pray for all those who have fallen in the struggle; we shall ask God to open to them the abode of comfort, of light, and of peace.

"Accordingly, you will as soon as possible cause a solemn service to be celebrated, with as much pomp as your church-funds will admit of. The mass to be read will be that '*In die obitûs*,' with the prayer '*pro pluribus defunctis*.' The service is to take place as soon as you can give notice of it to the faithful, even though it should be on the Sunday. During mass a collection is to be made for the relief of the indigent families of the dead and wounded. The amount of the collection is to be paid over by *MM. les Curés* to the *Maires* of their respective districts.

"The present letter is to be posted up wherever there may be occasion.

"Accept, *Monsieur le Curé*, the assurance of my sincere attachment.

"✠ DENYS, Archbishop of Paris.

"*Nota Bene.* In the event of its becoming necessary or desirable to establish temporary hospitals in your churches, you will not hesitate to offer them for that purpose, even though it should involve the omission of the Sunday Service.

"If that service can be performed, you will, after the parochial mass, sing the suffrage, '*Domine, Salvam fac Francorum gentem*,' &c., and the prayer, '*Deus a quo sancta desideria, recta consilia*,' &c."

Not more quickly was Louis Philippe unseated by the rabble at the Tuileries, than he was dethroned in the sanctuary by this right reverend prelate, who, moreover, is under personal obligation to him for his advancement to his present station; not more emphatically was the revolution eulogized by the provisional government in its proclamations to the people, than by the clergy in their addresses to heaven, in the liturgical phrase "holy desires and good counsels;" nor was the transfer of the Archbishop's allegiance from royalty to republicanism less easy

than the change from "*salvum fac Francorum regem*[2]" to "*salvam fac Francorum gentem*[3]."

This circular the Archbishop followed up by a personal demonstration. In full pontifical costume, with his crozier, and attended by a number of his clergy, he went to visit the principal hospitals of Paris, for the purpose of giving to the wounded heroes of the barricades "his benediction, and the consolations of his ministry." The reception which he met with, is represented by the *Ami de la Religion*, as having been most gratifying. Not content, however, with these first *impromptu* demonstrations, the Archbishop published, in the *Ami de la Religion* of March 4, an elaborate apology of the Revolution on "Catholic" grounds, in the form of a "*mandement*," ordering special prayers for the welfare of France. In this document he says:—

"On hearing that frightful clap of thunder which, without previous warning, shivered in an instant a throne surrounded by so much power, who among us could help recognizing at once the mysterious design of Him, who delights in showing to kings that *theirs is but a borrowed majesty?*

"Where is the Christian who, after having adored, with his face prostrate on the ground, *so prompt and so fearful an act of justice*, does not feel impelled to lift up his eyes to heaven, and to invoke upon France all its benedictions?

"Soon will France meet in her *Comitia*, for the purpose of appointing her representatives, who will in their turn be called upon to give us a new constitution. Let us not forget, dearly beloved brethren, that above all the legislative assemblies there is a Supreme Legislator, who alone 'causes just laws to prevail[4],' because He alone can instil into men's consciences a disinterestedness and love of justice and of true liberty, which rise superior to all human passions.

"Let us invoke that Wisdom, who *so often forsakes the thrones of the earth*, but who from all eternity is seated by the side of the throne of the Creator of the worlds. Let us invoke Her, that She may inspire our representatives; above all, let us invoke Her, that She may defend their work, if it shall be worthy of the great heart of France, against *the contemptible* interests which will perhaps endeavour to pervert it.

"Equity in the laws, equity in the magistrates who interpret them, or cause them to be executed, sincere submission on the part of all the citizens, a submission inspired by a great love of order, and *that civic*

[2] On the 1st of May last, the same Archbishop commenced his address of congratulation on Louis Philippe's birthday with these words: "*Sire*,—To-day we come into the royal palace to present to you our respectful homage. To-morrow we shall go to our temples to pray for your majesty and your august family."

[3] This was afterwards changed, by desire of the provisional government, first into "*salvum fac populum*," and subsequently into *salvam fac rempublicam*," which is the form for the present.

[4] This is a free translation of Prov. viii. 15, "By me kings reign, and princes decree justice," quoted by the Archbishop. Omitting the former clause "*reges regnant*," the Vulgate Version suits the occasion pretty well: "*Per me . . . legum conditores justa decernunt.*"

courage which defends society at the risk of life, are gifts of God, for 'every perfect gift comes from Him[5].' To that inexhaustible source, therefore, of every right sentiment and of every virtue, it behoves us to lift up our hearts with tender love and unshaken confidence."

The Archbishop then alleges the *dictum* of his predecessor in 1789, M. de Juigné, that "the welfare of the people is the supreme law," and proceeds to show that this *political* principle has always been upheld by the "Catholic" Church. For this purpose he quotes, first of all, Matth. xx. 27, "Whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant;" whence he demonstrates the appropriateness of the expression, "the public service," as used to designate "the different offices of the magistracy, the army, and the administration:" he then culls from Augustine, *De Civit. Dei*, the sentiment that "rulers should not rule through love of domination, but with a view to serve the public interests, that being the order of nature, the divinely appointed constitution of the human race;" whence the inference is made to follow, as a matter of course, that the principle of "liberty, equality, brotherhood," proclaimed by the Paris mob in February, 1848, is none other than the principle which the Church has cherished through the whole course of her existence from the beginning. A slight cloud of historical recollections for a moment overcasts this bright sunshine of "Catholic" republicanism; but the Archbishop speedily dissipates it.

"On consulting history, dearly beloved brethren, you will find, no doubt, that this spirit has penetrated but slowly, and almost imperceptibly, into the constitution of States; but fail not to observe that *the mission of the Church was not to impose by force a doctrine*, which was not intended to cause any other blood to be shed but that of His Apostles and Disciples.

"God, the absolute Lord of man whom He has drawn forth from nothingness, was pleased to respect his freedom; it became necessary, therefore, to induce him by persuasion to make a good use of power and fortune, and to subdue his passions; those who know the nature of our heart, will easily understand that, considering the infirmity of our judgment, this must have been the work of much time; but God is more patient than we are, because He is eternal.

"Let us not forget that, according to the Divine counsels, man regenerated by the Gospel, was to seek above all an eternal kingdom. But, lo, how wonderful! while pursuing his immortal destinies, man has fallen in with what constitutes the true prosperity of political societies!"

Once more in a fair train of demonstration that the radicalism of the nineteenth century is in fact nothing else than the perfect development of the Gospel, the Archbishop finds no difficulty in answering the extremely curious question, how it came to pass that the Church, "under the ancient monarchy, never thought of demanding a democratic constitution." *(Sic!)* The answer is obvious; though the Church

[5] The Archbishop actually quotes in a note the words of St. James, i. 17, "Every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights," and thus makes God the Holy Ghost the eulogist, and God the Father the fountain, of the heroism of the barricades.

thought a democratic constitution the most perfect, the only really Christian constitution, the Church kept that notion to herself out of forbearance for the insufficiently developed state of public opinion. The Church did not demand a democratic constitution, simply because "France had never thought of demanding it since the day when Clovis founded his throne upon one of the ruins of the Roman Empire." Still, he contends, the growth of liberal ideas was essentially the work of the Church, which he proves, *inter alia*, by the assertion that "the ancient States-general were constituted upon the pattern of the Councils of the Church;" and with the aid of a fine passage from one of Massillon's sermons, addressed to the corrupt court of Louis XV., and of the title of one of Bossuet's sermons, "The eminent dignity of the Poor," he lands again safely upon the socialist theories of M. Albert and M. Louis Blanc, who, if there is any truth in the Archbishop of Paris, apprehend Christian truth with infinitely greater clearness than all the "holy clerks and doctors" from St. Chrysostom and St. Augustine downwards.

Speaking of the first French revolution, M. d'Affre contends that it had the warm support of the clergy, and would at once have secured the happiness of France for ever, but for the unfortunate circumstance that the liberals of that day did not, like the liberals of the present day, reciprocate the sympathies of the Church. This leads him into a train of thought which might have proved fulsome towards the heroes of the barricades, if he had not checked himself in time to avoid so very ugly and unmerited a suspicion.

"We do not wish to flatter you, dearly beloved brethren, but we cannot help blessing you; you who, on the still smoking ruins of the power which has just fallen, have shown so profound a respect for the rights of that Sovereign Lord, who teaches kings in a manner so worthy of Himself, that they ought to use their power as He himself does, for the good of the world."

Having accounted for the failure of the first revolution, and pointed out the "old man seated on St. Peter's chair," and the French Episcopate, as the only parties who had the courage to raise their voice in defence of liberty against the despotism of Napoleon, the Archbishop approaches what might be considered rather tender ground,—the conduct of the clergy under the restoration. But even by this difficulty the boldness of his historical pen is not daunted. Confounding in one common condemnation the divine right of the elder and the citizen royalty of the younger Bourbon branch, he thus continues:

"You are aware what has been the fate of our liberties under the constitutional government which has ruled over us for these thirty-four years; but, *perhaps, you have not taken sufficient account of the motives of that isolation of the Clergy* which many persons have mistaken for a hostility which never had any existence.

"Every body protested his love for liberty; but, we ask you, was the love for it sincere, disinterested? Those who held the reins of government, constantly complained that liberty was stretched too far; and they laboured to restrict it, at one time by jurisprudence, at another time by new laws. The different opposition parties, once having reached

the helm, were, each in its turn, eager to circumscribe within narrow limits that self-same liberty which a short time before they had desired without limits ; while those whom fortune had flung down from the top of her wheel, appealed to the right against which they had quite recently pronounced a curse, and endeavoured to enchain it.

" Egotism was no less fatal to commercial freedom ; those opposition parties were always at war with each other, the one demanding, the other repelling every check upon free trade. *What better course could we take than to remain strangers to those conflicts of which the last three reigns have been made up?* To what dangers would our ministry have been exposed, if we had not withdrawn from the scene of this incessant struggle, in order to rise into a purer atmosphere less liable to be disturbed by storms!"

Thus, then, " the murder is out" at last. If the Romish clergy did not take kindly to the successive administrations of Louis XVIII., Charles X., and Louis Philippe, it was not, as a purblind world has hitherto supposed, because they disapproved of the free institutions which accompanied the restoration, and on which the throne of the citizen king was founded, but because not one of these governments,—no, not even that of M. Thiers, which raised M. d'Affre to the See of Paris—was liberal enough for the Romish hierarchy and priesthood, who were, as is now at last " told in Gath, and published in the streets of Askelon," all the while " free traders," but too forbearing to the weakness of humankind to let that fact be known. In one respect only the Archbishop reminds his flock, the Romish hierarchy and priesthood were avowedly "free traders ;" they stood up for " the liberty of instruction." For this, he says, " they have contended these ten years ;" and he leaves it to be inferred that for this they will contend now more than ever. In the general scramble for power, they hope, under the name of liberty of teaching, to secure something very like a monopoly of enslaving the minds of the rising generations with their superstitions. Trusting to the simplicity of his readers, the Archbishop " doubts not that observations so simple (*sic!*) will suffice to do away with the baneful prejudice that they, the Romish clergy, are hostile to political liberties."

" We did not love those liberties which were proclaimed by the oppressors of the Church and of the country, nor those on which the heel of the conqueror was set, nor lastly those which never were any thing but a handle for ambition and cupidity. We shall love those which are about to triumph, because their object will be to protect all rights alike, and to bestow upon all the members of the great family, not a chimerical happiness with which we have been so often deluded, but all the happiness which, under laws and a government which are perfectly just, a mighty nation may enjoy."

With the expression of this confident expectation, and a few unctuous phrases, the Archbishop takes an affectionate leave, for the present, of his dearly-beloved flock, which, in conclusion, he apostrophizes as that " new Samson, the people of Paris, which needed but for a moment to shake the columns of an immense edifice, to turn it into a heap of ruins."

We have presented to our readers this extensive sketch of the *mandement* of the Archbishop of Paris, because, being addressed to the heart, so to speak, of revolutionary France, it is by far the fullest and most elaborate of the documents which the late events have elicited from the French Episcopate. His colleagues, however, are not a whit behind him in radicalism, though they have not felt themselves called upon to discourse as largely upon the subject.

The Archbishop of Lyons, for instance, the famous Cardinal De Bonald, who was no great admirer of the "system" of Louis Philippe, dispatches the subject very briefly in a circular to his clergy, dated February the 27th:—

"My dear fellow-labourers,—You are aware of the political changes which have taken place in France. It is not likely that we, who are always engrossed by eternal interests, shall be surprised to hear that the *hand of God, in His righteousness, overthrows thrones, and dashes crowns to pieces.*

"In the midst of the agitation of these first days, maintain yourselves calm, and repose all your trust in God's Providence. Set to the faithful *the example of obedience and submission to the republic.* You often wished to enjoy the liberty which renders our brethren in the United States so happy: that liberty you shall have. If the authorities desire to plant the national flag upon the religious edifices, comply eagerly with the wish of the magistrates. *The flag of the republic will always be a flag of protection for religion.*

"Zealously pursue, my dear fellow-labourers, your sacred mission; be attentive to the poor; concur in whatever measures may ameliorate the condition of the working man. It is to be hoped that the interests of the labouring class will at last be sincerely and effectually consulted.

"You will read this letter to the assembled faithful from your pulpit."

Whether it was through unsophisticated reliance on the sympathy expressed in this circular, we cannot tell; but the "working men" of Lyons have taken the cardinal at his word; for the *Gazette de Lyons* announces that a number of working men have quartered themselves upon the *grand Séminaire* of the diocese, where they insist on goodly fare, and obstinately refuse to quit.

The Archbishop of Cambrai, in a circular to his clergy of March the 1st, says:—"The Church has been the first to proclaim in the world the ideas of liberty, justice, humanity, universal brotherhood. She proclaims them afresh, in the face of all nations, by the voice of her august Head. She cannot, therefore, do otherwise than accept with confidence institutions which have for their object to secure the triumph of these holy laws."

"The Nation," says the Bishop of Saint Claude, in a circular of March 2nd, "will shortly be called upon by the provisional government, to give to itself a constitution—founded upon true civil and religious liberty. The priests of the living God being naturally the friends and protectors of all beneficial developments and social improvements . . .

have at all times shown that they are, first and foremost, impressed with those truths, on which the maintenance of social order depends, and which are declared in our sacred books, 'that all power is of God;' and that to obey the powers which Providence contrives for the nations in order to deliver them from despotism, from anarchy, and civil war, is a conscientious obligation." From this the Bishop concludes that the revolution was right, and that it is a religious duty to "submit to the new government which devotes itself to the public weal."

"For eighteen centuries," observes the Bishop of MARSEILLES, "the Church, herself unchangeable, has been a witness to all the vicissitudes in the life of nations. She has almost invariably presided over their birth, and formed their youth. She has often sustained them in their decrepitude, and often renewed their youth as an eagle's: in some instances she has united, but never altogether identified herself, with what they contained of a mortal nature. When that which was to perish had perished, she ever showed herself ready for the transformation which took place, submissively adoring the decrees of Providence, and never refusing the co-operation of her ministry of peace and charity.

"It is in this light, dearly beloved brethren, that we view the events which have just been accomplished. The Church will still be what she always has been."

"You are already aware," writes the Bishop of DIGNE, "that the government established in 1830 has been swept away by a tempest similar to that from which it rose. He that rules in the heavens, and on whom all empires are dependent, has once more given to the nations and the kings this great and fearful lesson. No power that disregards the general interests of the country, can ever take root in it. Every government which attempts to arrest the progressive development of the public liberties, will sooner or later be swallowed up by *that tide of ideas and legitimate wants which is constantly rising, and which can be controlled only by marking out for it a free and peaceable course.*

"It does not certainly become us to aggravate the misfortunes of those who are fallen, by recalling with bitterness the faults which have brought on their downfal. When they stood upright, we told them the truth, and we were not afraid to rouse their anger by so doing. Now that they are broken to pieces, we stand still with respectful pity before the ruins of their power."

Further on the Bishop intimates the price which the Romish hierarchy means to exact for its adhesion to democratic institutions. "The present," he says, adverting to the revolution of 1789, "bears no resemblance to the past. After the progress which public opinion and freedom have made, religious persecution would now be the signal of the downfal of any power which should dare to attempt it; and to whatever government France may commit its destinies, it will not be so foolish as to repeat by-gone faults, and to renew a struggle, at once most impious and most fruitless, against the Catholic conscience. It will clearly understand that we are all ready in defence of our faith to sacrifice our lives, even as we are all ready to defend that government, to love it, and to devote ourselves to its maintenance, if, faithful to its

principles, and no longer appealing against us, in bitter mockery, to all the exceptional and tyrannical laws of by-gone *régimes*, it will secure to us a frank participation in the public liberties. In putting forward our claim to this fruit of the new revolution, we do not, indeed, aspire to a privilege, which we should reject even if it were offered us, but to the full exercise of the common rights of all. Let this be clearly understood, and let the sincerity and loyalty of our language, which has so often been misconstrued, for once put an end to unjust prejudices; we require, FOR OURSELVES AND FOR ALL, liberty, but liberty frankly and entirely granted; the liberty of uniting and associating together, liberty of worship, liberty of conscience, and that which is inseparable from the rest, liberty of teaching."

"To induce you to co-operate," says the Archbishop of BORDEAUX, "most loyally in what is at this moment being established, what more need we do than remind you of the duties of the Christian, promulgated by the Church for eighteen centuries past? *The external forms of power have nothing absolute in them.* That the Church knows well: she who has seen so many dynasties pass away, so many thrones crumble in the dust, who has seen the face of society renewed by so many revolutions. But there is a divine basis on which all human institutions must rest: upon this ground, to which evil passions have no access, we shall always meet the sincere champions of order and freedom. *A great mission is opening before us*, dearly beloved brethren: it has been comprehended all over France; and especially, we say it with pride and pleasure, in this city and this diocese. . . .

"Let us pray, dearly beloved brethren, pray with confidence and fervour, that the spirit of wisdom and of strength may continue to descend abundantly upon the Church and upon France, and may *for ever consummate the great alliance of religion and liberty;* for true faith and true freedom, uniting together in the face of the world, reconcile all opinions, and fertilize every hope. 'Where the Spirit of the Lord is,' says St. Jerome[6], 'there is liberty,' there is happiness."

Cardinal DU PONT, the Archbishop of BOURGES, agrees with the Archbishop of Paris, that the barricade principles of 1848 are nothing more than the original principles of the Gospel:—"The principles, the triumph of which is to be the commencement of an entirely new era, are those which *the Church has always proclaimed*, and which she has quite recently proclaimed afresh before the whole world, through the mouth of her august Head, the immortal Pius IX. We are bound to accept them with confidence, and to await their successful development, entreating sovereign wisdom to enlighten the minds, to preside over the councils, to direct the wills, to the end that *all the advantages of a perfect brotherhood, based upon real equality and true liberty*, may be secured to the great nation to which it is our glory to belong."

Much in the same strain the Bishop of MANS says: "The motto of the government is, 'Liberty, equality, brotherhood.' These three words

[6] Better read in the Fathers than in his Bible, the radical prelate quotes 2 Cor. iii. 17, as a sentiment of St. Jerome!

express three eminently Christian verities. It is Jesus Christ who has given to the world the Christian liberty, the source and pattern of all true liberty, by delivering it from the bondage of sin; equality, by granting to all men the same spiritual privileges, and the same rights before God; brotherhood, by calling them all 'his brethren,' and the children of the same Father in heaven. The Apostles, faithful to this teaching of their divine Master, gave the name of 'brethren' to all those who shared with them the blessings of faith and of grace. At no time have bishops and priests called the faithful by any other name in their religious instructions[7], nor will they ever cease to call them by this name.

"Let us then, without abandoning ourselves to an enthusiasm which would ill become our character, but likewise without evincing repugnance or fear, which would be ill-suited to our origin and our principles, —let us, I say, show that we understand liberty, that we love equality, that we sincerely desire brotherhood."

The Bishop of Saint Flour grows quite enthusiastic; especially for those beardless fathers of the republic, the boys of the Polytechnic:— "Let us all unite with heart and mind to implore the 'Father of mercies and God of all consolation,' to pour out abundantly His light and His grace upon the entire nation, *upon the noble and devoted men whom it has invested with its confidence,* and more particularly upon *those admirable youths whose noble conduct is the glory of France, and the hope of the Church.*" And elsewhere he observes, "The finger of God is visible in the midst of the grave events which have been brought about with lightning speed; and His providence still watches in love over our beautiful country."

"You will declare to all," says the Bishop of Beauvais, "that the heavenly country, the object of our desires, cannot render us indifferent to the interests of the country of which Providence has made us citizens, that the hour is come for all to devote and to attach themselves more closely than ever to the Christian faith, to order, and our country.

"This is what you will impress upon others. As for yourselves, leaving institutions which have ceased to exist, in the category of bygone things, you will not forget that *the Church does not fetter the conscience of her children and the exercise of her ministry to forms of government; that she has no feudal connexion with any political system; that she can live quite as easily under a republic as under a monarchy, provided her demands are granted;* and among them, before all and above all, the liberty of labouring for the salvation of souls and the happiness of all. *The order of things which is now being inaugurated, has not in itself any thing contrary to the doctrine and the morality of the Gospel.*"

Lastly, the Bishop of Perpignan is not content to applaud revolution on this side the grave, he extends his expansive liberalism to the unseen world:—"The day after to-morrow, Monday, at ten o'clock precisely, will be performed in our cathedral church, and in the parish

[7] Except the fashionable preachers at Paris, who commence their Advent and Lent Sermons and other discourses quaintly enough with "*Monseigneur, Messieurs.*"

churches of Perpignan, a solemn service for all the victims whom death has struck down at Paris in so unforeseen a manner, and who have *died in the Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman faith*, on the 22nd, 23rd, and 24th of February last. Charity is universal; we shall pray for *all those that have fallen in the struggle.* We shall *ask God to open to them all the place of comfort, of light, and of peace.*"

Such are a few brief specimens selected from the mass of extraordinary compounds of false religious and political sentiment with which the columns of the *Ami de la Religion* have been crowded ever since the first outbreak of the Revolution. Few, indeed, are those among the episcopal circulars which, like that of the Cardinal De la Tour D'Auvergne, confine themselves to a mere dry compliance with the government requisition, by ordering the celebration of a funeral service, and the insertion of the suffrage, "*Salvam fac rempublicam*," in the liturgy; still more rare, solitary, in fact, as far as the documents which have reached us go, is the determination, expressed by the Bishop of Nantes, to stand avowedly aloof from the present movement. "In circumstances so grave," says the circular of the last-named prelate to his clergy, "it is our duty to remind you, that our mission is to concern ourselves exclusively for the spiritual interests of souls, and that as regards questions of a political or temporal nature, we must leave Providence to solve them in its infinite wisdom. . . .

"Let us abstain from meddling in the affairs of this world: let us avoid every judgment, every opinion, every comment having reference to events in which it does not become us to take any part; but let our conduct in all things be such, that even 'he that is of the contrary part may be ashamed, having no evil thing to say of us.'

"As for the charge over which you are placed, you will apply to it most strictly those principles; you will avoid with extreme care whatever could give rise to the slightest conflict between you and the local authorities, every act or measure which might irritate the population; making it, on the contrary, your business to maintain among all the most perfect harmony you can. Should any difficulty present itself, which you might be in doubt how to resolve, or which might be beyond the scope of the ordinary rules, you will abstain from acting, and refer the matter immediately to myself."

While the clergy are thus almost unanimously joining the revolutionary cry of "liberty, equality, brotherhood," there appears to be a strong disposition on the part of the provisional government to secure their good-will and co-operation. The provisional minister of public instruction and worship addressed, on the 11th of March, a circular to the "Archbishops and Bishops of the republic;" in which, after giving them official notice of the decree of the provisional government for the insertion of the words, "*Salvam fac rempublicam*," in the liturgy, which most of them had already acted upon as soon as the decree had appeared in the *Moniteur*, M. Carnot expresses himself highly satisfied with the conduct of the clergy in giving in their unanimous adhesions to the establishment of the republic.

"Their assent, I am convinced, is not merely that vague submission

to whatever may be the form of the established government, which the Church might have acted on under changes which did nothing more than displace crowns, and substitute one dynasty for another. The clergy meet the new order of things with a more real sympathy. In hastening to proclaim in their prayers the republic which the people have just founded by the energy of their sovereign will, the clergy have felt that the inauguration of the republican principle opened a new era for the noble and exalted sentiments which God has implanted in the heart of man, and which it is the mission of religion to develop.

" In this reconstitution of the rights and interests of all, the clergy in the different grades of the hierarchy must have understood that the rights and interests of religion, as well as of its ministers, would be protected by the institutions, as they were by the respect of the people during the glorious days. This support will not be that vacillating and uncertain support which princes have often given to religion, in the hope of associating it in the evil designs of their policy: the clergy will find, in the conformity of their sentiments with those of the people, a more solid and more durable protection.

" Let the ministers of religion, therefore, place faith in the republic: let them turn their eyes with confidence towards the national assembly, which is called upon by the votes of the people to regulate the destinies of the country."

In connexion with this subject, the minister throws out a hint which almost amounts to an invitation to the clergy to come forward as candidates at the ensuing election. " Above all," he says, " suffer not the clergy of your diocese to forget, that being citizens, and as such sharers in the exercise of all political rights, they are the children of the great family of France; and that in the electoral assemblies, and *upon the benches of the national assembly*[8], to which the confidence of their fellow-citizens might call them, they have but a single interest to defend,—that of the country, which is intimately united with that of religion."

Upon this circular the *Ami de la Religion* observes, in a tone of high gratulation :—" ' Liberty, equality, brotherhood,' those noble and holy words were Christian before they became political; before the republic, the Gospel had proclaimed them in the world.

" Let the republic maintain those principles pure and sincere, as the Church has done for eighteen centuries; and the Church, following up her own work, will marvellously advance the work of the republic."

The *Ami de la Religion* next adverts to the passage of the ministerial circular before quoted, respecting the right of the clergy not only to vote for members, but themselves to sit in the future national assembly, and adds, " These are noble sentiments, nobly expressed. All the clergy share them, and we can answer for it that their conduct will respond to them. Both as citizens and priests, filled with infinite love for religion and for their country, the clergy will understand that both

[8] The *Ami de la Religion* of March 23rd, apparently by way of a feeler, mentions "a report which it does not guarantee," that several bishops, the Archbishop of Paris among the rest, have been proposed as candidates for the national assembly.

these great interests impose upon them the duty of using the political rights conferred upon them by the new electoral decree.

"The position of affairs is now entirely changed. What would but a short time ago have been a purely political act, becomes, under existing circumstances, a duty towards the country, towards society and religion.

"No one will feel surprised to see a priest come forward at the elections in order to give his vote for the candidate who, in his opinion, is the most able and the most trustworthy.

"No one will feel surprised to see the priest take his place in the national assembly, in which necessarily the interests of religion, as well as those of the country, will be discussed.

"And on the benches of the national representation, as well as in the electoral assemblies, the priests, mingling with their fellow-citizens, will always know how to cause the dignity of their character to be respected, the wisdom of their conduct to be honoured, and the patriotism of their sentiments to be admired."

The advice thus given by the *Ami de la Religion* has been issued in the shape of a command by the Cardinal *de la Tour d'Auvergne*, in a circular to the clergy of his diocese (Arras), dated March 10, 1848, and which is to the following effect:—

"Important and extensive elections are about to take place. All France is called upon to choose its representatives with a view to decide the fate of our beautiful country. On this all-important and most serious emergency we are all her children; we owe her our assistance and our support. To abandon her would be not only an act of cowardice on our part, but a sin against charity; it would be an unchristian dereliction of duty.

"You, therefore, *M. le Curé*, and all the ecclesiastics depending on you, will have to attend at the approaching elections, to give your votes, and to come to an understanding on the subject with all those who sincerely wish and desire the preservation of all that is good and holy.

"Remember that we are all brethren, and that we are to love God above all, and our neighbour as ourselves.

"Therefore, let there be among ourselves perfect union, and let us give our aid and support to the public cause."

Similar instructions and exhortations to the clergy, to take an active part in the approaching elections, are contained in others of the episcopal circulars. The Bishop of Angers, for instance, after insisting on the duty of every Frenchman to take part in the re-constitution of the social edifice, thus continues:—

"Lastly, after calling upon others, shall we call upon you also, beloved fellow-labourers, whom we have so often besought to confine yourselves within the limits of the sanctuary?

"We feel timid in making this call upon you; not that we doubt your devotedness, seeing that we behold you consecrating your talents, your zeal, your whole life to your brethren, in an obscure ministry. But there must be no room left for accusing us of indifference, and since, in this exceptional emergency, on which depend, perhaps, the

future destinies of society and of religion, all are called on, come, I say, to discharge your debt, ye labourers of the Lord's vineyard; remembering that, according to the expression before quoted, (from the instructions of the provisional government,) this is not only *a right*, but *a duty*. Indeed, for the rebuilding of Jerusalem the Levites also were called upon. 'They appointed the Levites, from twenty years old and upward, to set forward the work of the Lord.'"

"The provisional government of France," says the Archbishop of Aix, "has issued a decree, calling upon all Frenchmen to nominate representatives who shall presently attend to all the great interests of our country. Now you are a French citizen, *M. le Curé*, you are therefore to obey the command given you. Accordingly you will proceed to the chief place of your canton, in order to nominate those of your fellow-citizens whom you shall judge to be best qualified to labour for the welfare of the people and the State, to establish permanent laws, and a constitution under which we may lead a peaceable life."

But the most extraordinary among the documents bearing upon this point, is the circular of the Bishop of St. Brieuc:—"We consider it a duty of conscience for our clergy, and for all the faithful who are entitled to do so, to proceed to the elections. We have already pointed out, that the settlement of our country's fate is the point at issue. In reference to such a question no one can remain indifferent.

"In order to make it possible for all electors to fulfil this duty, we authorize the rectors to change on that day the hours of high mass and of vespers, and even to omit them entirely, if necessary. In this case it would be sufficient to say low mass at a very early hour, in order to be in time for the elections.

"Our wish is that *the electors of every parish, priests and laity, should proceed together to the place of election, and should not separate, if possible, all the time they will have to remain at the chief place of the canton.* After recording their votes, and as soon as they are at liberty, they will return to their parish church, observing the same order in returning as in going."

An absolute democracy, founded on the universal suffrage of the masses, organized and marshalled by the priests, this is the *beau idéal* of Popish politics, both in France and elsewhere; though, as the hour has not yet arrived, few have the candour of the Bishop of St. Brieuc, to say so in so many words.

A circumstance connected with this alliance between the new *régime* and the Romish hierarchy, which has attracted a good deal of notice and observation, is the conspicuous part played from the first by the Archbishop of Paris, and the manner in which he is singled out by the Liberals, as if he were not only the mouth-piece of the entire Episcopate of France, but its leader. To such a position M. d'Affre is not entitled either by his ecclesiastical rank or by his personal qualifications; and considerable jealousy has been excited by a vague suspicion that the busy and obtrusive republicanism of M. d'Affre proceeds from an ambitious hope that the title of prelate of the metropolis might merge into that of metropolitan of the republic. Under this impression, the

Univers qualifies its praise of M. Carnot's circular by the following addition :—" We regret, however, to find that the minister in all his circulars studiously distinguishes the Archbishop of Paris from his venerable colleagues. The effect this produces is the more unpleasant, as M. Carnot has the credit of certain notions of ecclesiastical centralization, which it would be impossible to attempt to realize, without raising an unanimous and irresistible opposition in the Episcopate, and in the clergy at large. The Archbishop of Paris himself, every body knows, would combat any attempt of this kind more energetically than any one else, and the Holy See would assuredly not suffer any thing of the kind."

Notwithstanding the alarm of the *Univers*, and the ambitious aspirations,—if such he entertains,—of M. d'Affre, there appears to be but little danger, at present, of any system of " ecclesiastical centralization" being adopted in France. Indeed the position of the Romish clergy in that country is, in spite of their *impromptu* radicalism, far from secure. In various places unpleasant outbreaks have occurred, indicative of any thing but a friendly feeling towards the clergy on the part of the republicans. In several places the parsonages have been demolished by the populace, and the clergymen themselves narrowly escaped with their lives. But the direction in which the tide of popular feeling seems to set most strongly against the Romish church, is hostility against religious orders, both male and female, even against the Sisters of Charity, who have, in some instances, been obliged to leave their communities, and to seek for refuge elsewhere. The most flagrant act of interference of this nature, is the expulsion of the Capuchin monks from their house at Brotteaux, in the diocese of Lyons, and the official decree of " Citizen Emmanuel Arago, commissary of the provisional government" at Lyons, who, reciting the laws of 1789, 1790, 1792, *an* XII., 1809, 1817, 1825, and complaining of their violation by the establishment of unauthorized religious congregations, declares that such violation ought to be speedily put an end to in the department of the Rhone, and accordingly decrees that "all non-authorized religious corporations and congregations, and especially that of the Jesuits, are and remain dissolved ;" and directs the civil officers of the department to give immediate effect to this declaration.

The ire manifested on the occasion both by the *Lyons Gazette* and by the *Ami de la Religion*, is highly characteristic, showing the alarm under which the writers are, lest, after betraying the principles, and belying the character, of their church for the sake of currying favour with radicalism, they should be disappointed at last of their anticipated reward.

" To add derision," exclaims the former, " to this terrible abuse of authority, they talk to us of 'the law which does not recognize any congregations but those which have been authorized by it.'

" The law, you say! Pray what law? the law of the Kingdom! And you have the audacity to appeal to that! Are we, then, still under the *régime* of the laws of Louis XVI., of Napoleon, of Louis XVIII., and of Louis Philippe? Besides, does the question really turn upon the *recognition of a congregation?* Do the Capuchins perchance require to

be recognized? Do they ask for a legal existence, with corporate rights, and the power to possess and to inherit corporate property? By no means. On the contrary, what they ask is, not to be recognized, to remain simple citizens, constantly isolated in their individual capacity before the law, but united in the same house, because that suits them, and because the law to which you appeal not only does not forbid, but formally and explicitly authorizes, the dwelling together in one and the same house of any given number of citizens.

"We have said it a hundred times, but we shall repeat it a thousand times, since we have to deal with men who are so hard of understanding: if twenty or thirty scamps were to club together to live in common, and to celebrate perpetual orgies, you would find no law for dispersing them; but let those men of their own accord change their manner of life, let them put on cowls, go barefoot, let their beards grow, live a life of self-denial, distribute their savings among the poor of the neighbourhood, and lo, on the instant you will fancy yourselves entitled to drive them from their home! .... No! such violence, so destitute of logic, is incredible!

"And that, let it be understood, on the morrow of a revolution whose object was liberty; at a time when all the secret societies, clubs, communist lodges, break out openly, proclaim their deeds of yesterday, and sing by anticipation their triumphs of to-morrow; when the widest channels are thrown open to the manifestation of men's thoughts, when the greatest and most unfettered latitude of private life becomes the patrimony of all."

Not less irate is the language of the *Ami de la Religion* in reference to this despotic proceeding on the part of "one of the pro-consuls of M. Ledru-Rollin."

"If there is a liberty which has been loudly proclaimed by the new republic, a liberty instantly put in practice by all parties, surely it is the liberty of association; and from this very liberty they debar the clergy at the outset.

"Fifty clubs have been opened at Paris; a thousand corporations of different trades and guilds unite themselves, and enter into combination with each other, in order to maintain their rights and to defend their interests.

"Let them try and put in force against these the laws against associations and political unions!

"Let them try and say to them, 'Considering the law of the year 1790, considering such and such a decree of the Empire, CONSIDERING THE PROTESTS JUSTLY RAISED UNDER THE GOVERNMENT WHICH HAS FALLEN, all political associations are and remain dissolved.'

"Can you fancy the shout of laughter, or the howl of fury with which such a decree would be received, if it were drawn up in the name of the people," (the superscription of all decrees under the provisional government, and specifically of that issued by Citizen Arago,) "even though it should be notified by a commissary of the provisional government!

"And is it to be supposed that what they would not dare to attempt

against the right of association in political matters, they may do with impunity against the same right, when religion is the object in view? That is a grand and most fatal mistake.

"It is well known in what admirable spirit of submission, with what sentiments of loyal adhesion, the clergy of France, through their bishops, promised, or rather gave spontaneously, their concurrence to the provisional government.

"This was done because the Episcopate and the entire clergy relied on the solemn promises of the government; because we all took the *motto* of the republic seriously.

"But if we are deceived, if, while proclaiming liberty, equality, brotherhood for all, it is intended to exclude the Catholic Church from the benefit of these great and dearly purchased principles; if at a time when all exceptional laws break to pieces of themselves, laws of oppression against the clergy and against religious corporations are sought for in the legislation of all the *régimes* that have been abolished, then it is no longer liberty, but tyranny, that is brought to us; not equality, but the privilege of oppression, hatred in the place of brotherhood, in one word, it is war.

"We hope that, before entering upon this career of proscription, the provisional government will be far-sighted enough to perceive the precipice which is at the end of it."

A much more powerful voice, however, than that of either the *Gazette de Lyons*, or the *Ami de la Religion*, has been raised against the proceedings of the "commissary of the provisional government;" no less a voice than that of the Cardinal Archbishop of Lyons himself. The following letter from his pen appears in the *Ami de la Religion*:—

"Mr. Editor, "Lyons, March 13, 1848.

"In contending for the liberty of the Church, I declared in writing that the press must in our day be the refuge of all oppressed Catholics. To it I have recourse now, in order to protest against the recent violation of the great principle of association by the sentence directed against unauthorized religious communities. I share the painful impression which this act of the administration has produced upon all right-thinking people. And if, as bishop, I have a right to complain, my duty as citizen requires of me that I should protest with all my might against the violation of a principle which the nation has conquered for itself.

"The Catholic religion was among the foremost in hailing the establishment of a republic, and has offered to God for it sincere prayers, unsolicited supplications. It felt its confidence increasing, on seeing devoted and intelligent men charged by the people, under beginnings so laborious, with the direction of the new order of things. Its liberty was guaranteed to religion; a promise was given that its independence should be respected; for a long time religion had not heard promises so consoling. The Church had, therefore, a right to hope that the hand of the republic was about to break in pieces, irrevocably, the parliamentary and Gallican chains by which its action had hitherto been fettered. It had no longer to fear lest its ministers should be summoned

before the council of state, for the purpose of hearing the word of the Gospel insulted in their persons, and being subjected to a sentence of condemnation for having dared to obey God rather than men. Such were the hopes which filled our hearts and indited to us our adhesion to the new form of government. But it could not have entered into our minds, that the most sacred of the rights of the Church, as well as of the citizens,—that of associating, of uniting, of assembling, of combining together,—would be refused to us. We thought ourselves already in possession of that entire freedom, which in the United States is so well understood, and enjoyed by all religions without the fear of being deprived of it.

"The recent decree on religious communities has discovered to us the whole extent of our delusion. The phalansterians (socialists) unite together and hold their discussions; the householders form themselves into clubs, and treat of political affairs; the women[8] have, at Paris, formed a deliberative assembly, and are concerting measures for the defence of their rights; banquets are organized in every direction. Have the members of these different associations or unions required a previous authorization from the government, in order to consecrate the existence of their societies? Have they thought of soliciting the consent of the authority? If they had done so, they would have shown that they did not understand the spirit of our new institutions, they would have forgotten that the principle of association is one of the bases of the republic.

"Are we, then, to understand that association for purposes of prayer and charity is alone forbidden? Is it an attempt against the public safety for men to unite their zeal and beneficence for the purpose of binding up the wounds of a few sick folks, preserving the innocence of a few children, reclaiming to the paths of virtue a few wandering souls, and instructing some ignorant people? Are we to be told that the republic, which is powerful enough to call a million of soldiers under arms, and to make Europe tremble, is tottering on its foundations, because a few Christians in black or white, grey or brown dresses, offer prayers in their retirement, and interrupt the slumbers of the night for the purpose of singing the praises of God? There was nothing to call forth the decree against which I protest, and the issuing of which the republican principles ought to have prevented. The tears of a few women sent back to their homes, and of a few orphans cast out into the streets, cannot give to the new order of things a very solid support. The principle of association is absolute; by violating it in the least degree, every thing is brought again in question and shaken; hope vanishes, and the enthusiasm of the first days gives way to a cruel disenchantment.

[8] This is no exaggeration. A numerous deputation of the laundresses of Paris waited upon the provisional government the other day, to complain of the decomposing effects of competition upon soap-suds; to which one of the provisional secretaries of state blandly replied by an assurance that the perplexities of the wash-tub had, among other perplexities, already occupied the attention of those in power. See *Ami de la Religion* of March 16.

"I have written to the provisional minister of public instruction and worship to enter my protest against the decree in question.

"I request of you, M. Editor, the favour of your inserting my protest in your journal.

"Accept the assurance of my high esteem.

"L.-J.-M., Cardinal De Bonald,
Archbishop of Lyons."

Before we close this notice of the development of Popery under the democratic *régime*, a subject to which, on account of its all-absorbing importance, and the interest of the documents connected with it, we have thought it right to devote the greater part of our space for foreign intelligence on the present occasion, we must not omit to mention an article of the *Ami de la Religion*, called forth by the abolition of the oath of allegiance by a recent decree of the provisional government; the reasoning of which forms a strange contrast with the assurance given elsewhere by the Romish bishops, that their allegiance to the temporal governments under which they live never can clash in the remotest degree with the duties and requirements of their spiritual office.

"The Church," says the *Ami de la Religion*, "has suffered too much, from the time of the pagan emperors to our own, from the various tyrannies imposed upon the consciences of the faithful in connexion with the oath, for her not to hail with entire satisfaction the decision by which the provisional government of the republic abolishes the political oath.

"This act, and the considerations which prompted it, mark a sound policy. The experience of the last fifty years could not fail to bring about this consecration of the ideas and facts of modern society.

"But to these motives of an intelligent policy the Church has to add more serious reasons for her adhesion to that policy. Among the most devoted soldiers of the Roman empire, it is well known that the first Christians showed themselves the most intrepid and the most faithful, without there being any necessity to bind them by an oath. 'O Cæsar, we are at any time ready to die for the welfare of the empire, although we shrink from swearing by your *genii*:' such was the cry of the Theban legion, and of that other battalion composed of Christians, which, under the Emperor Decius, had earned the surname of the 'thundering legion.' Now those invincible patriots of the first ages of the Church exhibited in practice only that which they had gathered from the Gospel, and from the instruction of their bishops. The Christian religion neither admitted nor excluded any form of temporal government; it prescribed an equal obedience to all, because 'there is no power but of God.'

"If it should enter any one's head, unseasonably to call to mind, in reference to this subject, *the old quarrels about 'the divine right,'* all the answer we should need to give in order to justify our approbation of the liberal act of the suppression of the oath, would be the following declaration of M. Clausel de Cossergue, in 1831:—'The word oath *cannot at this time have the same meaning as under a* régime *under*

which religion was intimately connected with the State; since the oath is required even of those who make a public profession of Atheism, *the oath is no longer a religious act.* . . . . The only obligation that remains, is that of voting at elections for the worthiest man, and for the greatest benefit of the country. . . . .' Such was the language of an upright and loyal royalist in 1831: the divine right was, to his mind, the right of conscience, or rather the true interpretation of the Gospel, and the carrying out of the principles of the Church. At this time again governments cannot have trustier defenders, than the men who act upon such principles.

" But, in return for their support, the newly-established order of things must really be an era of true liberty for religion. This exemption from the oath, which we are surprised not to see extended to the army also, must above all *emancipate the bishops,* those apostles of submission as well as of evangelical charity. Away with political trammels to their sacred ministry. Religious liberty, that liberty whose only mission is to cause the love of order to strike deep roots in the consciences, must obtain its entire and pacific development."

If this reasoning does not prove that oaths of allegiance from Popish bishops to a non-Popish government are compatible with the principles of their Church, it proves at least that it is useless to exact such oaths, and idle to put any faith in them.

Italy.—*Consistorial Appointments.*—The following is a summary of the Episcopal appointments made by Pope Pius IX. during the year 1847, in the several consistories of April 12th, June 11th, June 14th, October 4th, and December 17th :—

4 Cardinals.
2 Patriarchs.
9 Metropolitans.
2 Archbishops.
36 Bishops.

Of the four cardinals, two were Italians; one, Joseph Bofondi, dean of the Rota; and the other, James Antonelli, prefect of the pontifical treasury; both raised to the dignity of cardinal deacons: the other two were French prelates; one, Pierre Giraud, Archbishop of Cambrai; the other, Jacques-Marie-Antoine-Célestin Dupont, Archbishop of Bourges; both raised to the dignity of cardinal priests.

The two patriarchs are, the new patriarch of the Latin rite at Jerusalem, and the patriarch of the West Indies.

Of the nine Metropolitans, two are for Italian provinces; one in the Pontifical States, the other in Lombardy; one for France; four for Spain; one for Austria; and one for South America.

Of the two Archbishops, one is titular of Sida, *in partibus infidelium;* the other is appointed coadjutor, with succession, of the United Churches of Rhodes, *in partibus,* and of Malta.

Lastly, the thirty-six Bishoprics are divided as follows:—

Italy,	Pontifical States	8
	Naples	2
	Tuscany	2
	Lombardy	1
	Sardinia	1
Spain	.. ..	17
France	.. ..	1
Germany	.. ..	2
The Canary Islands	.. ..	1
In partibus infidelium	.. ..	1

Of the whole of the forty-nine appointments (exclusively of the creations of cardinals) fifteen were translations; of the thirty-four clergymen raised to the Episcopate, twenty-four were taken from the ranks of the diocesan clergy, five had occupied academic dignities, four belonged to religious orders, and one was abbot of a collegiate church.

New Brunswick.—*Local Support of the Church.*—From a Report just published by the *Society for the Propagation of the Gospel*, it appears that this province is setting a noble example, by exerting itself with a view to the maintenance of its own Church. "Since the Church in New Brunswick," says the Report, "has had a resident Bishop at its head, it has not failed to put forth signs from which may be inferred a hopeful improvement in its spiritual condition. The people see the necessity of supporting their own Clergy from their own resources—of becoming at no distant period independent of their mother Church of England in pecuniary matters. New missions have been organized, the number of Clergy increased, churches founded, without fresh assistance from the Society in England."

We hail this indication of a healthy Church feeling in the Colonies with the greater satisfaction, as it appears that the resources of the Society at home are becoming more and more inadequate to the permanent support of its extensive operations in every quarter of the globe. Although the receipts of the Society during the year 1847, amounting to 85,068*l.* 7*s.* 3*d.*, exceed the Society's income during any former year, yet in reality the Society is poorer than ever. Nearly one-half of the above receipts consisted of contributions for *special* objects, more particularly for the newly-created Bishoprics in Australia; and as the *general* expenditure of the Society has not decreased, but is continually increasing, it became necessary in the course of last year to sell out the last remainder of the Society's capital, amounting to 30,191*l.* 0*s.* 5*d.* Under these circumstances we cannot forbear expressing our earnest hope that the appeal made by the Queen's Letter, recently issued, will be responded to by liberal contributions from every part of the country.

CONTENTS

OF

No. XVIII.

ART. PAGE

I.—1. Encyclic of our Most Holy Father, Pope Pius IX., addressed to all Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops, and Bishops.

2. Allocution of Pope Pius IX., pronounced in the Secret Consistory of December 17, 1847.

3. Fundamental Statute for the temporal government of the States of the Church.

4. Allocution of Pope Pius IX., pronounced in the Secret Consistory of April 29, 1848.

5. Proclamation of Pope Pius IX. 255

II.—The Princess; a Medley. By Alfred Tennyson..... 286

III.—1. Protest against the Ministrations in Madeira of the Rev. T. K. Brown in Opposition to Episcopal Authority and in Violation of the Laws and Constitution of the Church of England. By the Rev. R. T. Lowe, the Chaplain licensed by the Lord Bishop of London.

2. Appendix to a Protest, &c. by the Rev. R. T. Lowe.

3. The Madeira Chaplaincy treated of, and the Supremacy of the Queen vindicated, in a Letter addressed to the Rev. R. T. Lowe, by T. K. Brown, M.A., British Chaplain at Madeira..... 298

ART. PAGE

IV.—Bishop Jeremy Taylor, his Predecessors, Contemporaries, and Successors. A Biography. By the Rev. Robert Aris Willmott 315

V.—On the English Policy in Greece 338

VI.—Rest in the Church. By the Author of "From Oxford to Rome" 371

VII.—History of the Fall of the Jesuits in the Eighteenth Century. By Count Alexis de Saint-Priest, Peer of France. Translated from the French 391

Notices of Recent Publications, &c. 453

Foreign and Colonial Intelligence 485

THE

ENGLISH REVIEW.

JUNE, 1848.

Art. I.—1. *Encyclic of our Most Holy Father, Pope Pius IX., addressed to all Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops, and Bishops.* Given at Santa Maria Maggiore, November 20, 1846.

2. *Allocution of Pope Pius IX., pronounced in the Secret Consistory of* December 17, 1847.

3. *Fundamental Statute for the temporal government of the States of the Church.* Given at Santa Maria Maggiore, March 14, 1848.

4. *Allocution of Pope Pius IX., pronounced in the Secret Consistory of* April 29, 1848.

5. *Proclamation of Pope Pius IX.* Given at Santa Maria Maggiore, May 1, 1848.

"How are the mighty fallen!" Two years have not elapsed since the world rang with the praises of the Cardinal whom, in spite of his youth—ecclesiastically speaking, being a man of fifty-four, and a cardinal of but six years' standing—the almost unanimous voice of the Conclave raised to the Pontifical Chair. The election was announced by the Romish prints as little less than a miracle; and the popular party, both at Rome and throughout Europe, hailed it as the advent of a new era. "Let us thank God," exclaimed the unenthusiastic *Ami de la Religion* in a fit of unwonted ecstasy, "for this signal, we will say almost miraculous, proof of his protecting care for his Church! Considerations of a supernatural order evidently presided over all the thoughts of that venerable senate. The choice which the voice of the people seemed to designate beforehand, has been proclaimed by the voice of God through the mouths of those illustrious old men, who are in the Church the worthy representatives both of God and of the people." Those who were better informed of the human politics of Rome, and less credulous of supernatural agency in Papal elections, accounted for the choice of the Conclave, by the fact that the necessity or expediency of falling in with the spirit of the age had several years before been seriously debated among the heads of the Roman hierarchy, and for some time the balance had inclined towards the "liberal" side. The advanced years and the personal timidity of Gregory XVI. had retarded the impulse, but when that obstacle was removed by his death, the counsels of liberalism prevailed, and Cardinal Mastaï-Ferretti

was placed at the helm as the exponent of the "new system" about to be adopted. The "miracle" was precisely of the same nature as that which places a Russell on the treasury bench when free-trade measures are to be carried out at a rattling pace.

In saying this we are far from imputing to their eminences any felonious leaning towards democratic principles, much less any utopian dreams of liberalism. They are too virtuous, assuredly, to cherish the former, too sedate to indulge in the latter. Their stations only are exalted, not their heads. It is possible to conceive a radical, a chartist, or a repealer, or even a whig, acting from sheer enthusiasm: with regard to the members of the Conclave, such a supposition would be ridiculous in the extreme. Their determination to embrace "liberal" politics, was simply a matter of calculation; they found that the Papacy was losing ground, that the half-hopes of the restoration of Papal ascendancy, which the Holy Alliance had excited, had not been realized; that the sovereigns were more chary of their compliance with the demands and expectations of Rome than had been expected; that they had neither the power nor the will to make their politics subservient to the supremacy of "the Sovereign See of Christendom."

In their own view of the matter this change of system on the part of the Cardinals was a mere question of being "wise in their generation;" but in a higher view of the subject, they were unconsciously obeying the imperious law of a moral necessity. There is a Nemesis in the affairs of men which often compels great criminals to become their own executioners, by some fatal, reluctant, but inevitable act. That Nemesis has at last overtaken the Papacy, the most criminal of offenders against God and man known to history since the world has been Christianized. Politicians, according to their shallow estimate of human affairs, may say that the Papacy has overreached itself; we must go one step further, and say, that the Papacy has been forced to prepare its own downfall. The circumstances are too remarkable, their bearing upon the prospects of the world generally too important, to suffer us to pass by in silence the extraordinary revulsion by which, in an incredibly short space of time, the complimentary anagram

> "A Giovanni-Maria Mastaï-Ferretti;—
> Grati nomi, amnistia e ferrata via;"—

has been supplanted by the pasquinade,

> "Roma! poichè colui che vedi in Trono
> La gloria della guerra a Te negò,
> In vece di Pio Nono,
> Chiamate, Pio, No! No!"

Such is the pithy account which the punster spirit that hovers on the banks of the Tiber gives of the reaction by which the idol of Rome and of the "Catholic world" has become a captive in the palace of the Quirinal. The effect is sufficiently evident; but the question remains, what are the real causes which have produced that effect? what the circumstances which have hurried on its development with such astounding rapidity? An alliance between the Antichristian spirit of the Papacy and the infidel spirit of radicalism, and, as its result, the overthrow of the Papal power, was expected by the students of prophecy,—but that the punishment would follow so quickly upon the heels of the offence, is what few, we believe, anticipated.

Yet, if we examine the history of this "development" more closely, we shall cease to wonder at the suddenness of the catastrophe. What has befallen the Papacy, is nothing more than what invariably befalls all the speculators upon the tendencies of the democracy. In their eagerness to turn these tendencies to account, they forget that the effect of their abetting them will be to accelerate their progress; that the democracy is a huge engine with a monster-train attached, on an inclined plane, and that every passenger that jumps up to travel by it, adds to the *momentum* in proportion to his weight, and thereby helps to produce the frightful velocity with which the train itself, with all that are embarked on it, is descending towards the terminus of destruction.

That Rome never could sincerely embrace the principles of radicalism, is so manifest, that the only wonder is how the world could ever have conceived the idea of a *bonâ fide* radical Pope. Not that Rome is, or ever was, favourable to principles of loyalty. Far from it: it has ever been the policy of Rome to trade upon the disloyalty of subjects, and to turn sedition and rebellion to account for its own advancement. The boldest champions of the Papacy in every country, and in every age, have been traitors to their lawful sovereigns. But this is not on account of any sympathy between the principles of the Papacy and those of the democracy; it arises from the fact that the Papacy, claiming to be a despotism superior to every other rule and dominion, views and treats as rebels all the powers which refuse to acknowledge that dominion, and venture to assert their own independence. The refractory vassal of the feudal ages, the demagogue of modern times, who raise the standard of sedition, and embroil kingdoms in civil war, thus become the natural allies of the Papacy, standing in much the same position as a rebel who deserts to the royal cause, or a conspirator who turns king's evidence.

But whilst the Papacy must certainly be acquitted of any

abstract love of democratic principles, it is evident, on the other hand, that whatever there has been in times past of a conservative character in its political tone and attitude, did not arise from any abstract allegiance to, or even preference for, monarchical principles and institutions. If Rome ranged herself on the side of the monarchs of Europe, if she set on their brow the sanction of divine appointment, and anointed them in the name of the Most High, it was not because the Papacy felt itself called upon ministerially to affirm the principle that "the powers that be, are ordained of God;" but because the Papacy finding them in possession of the power over the nations, deemed it convenient for the furtherance of its own purposes to acknowledge their right, and by the consecration conferred upon it, to create an appearance of subordination to itself as the fountain from which they derived that right. The only political principle in which the Papacy has any faith, is that of its own supremacy over all the powers of the world, whatever may be their name or character; and even this faith rests on a foundation of fact rather than of abstract right; for the arguments which are put forward in controversy in support of the *jure divino* claims of Rome, all resolve themselves into this, that the *de facto* supremacy which Rome acquired in course of time, proves the correctness of the interpretation put by Rome upon certain texts of Scripture, and certain passages of the Fathers.

Thus it appears that in reality the Papacy is without any principle whatever whereon to take its stand, not only with reference to the claims of others, which it may be called upon to acknowledge or to resist, but even with regard to its own extravagant claims to universal dominion. The assertion of principles as the grounds of its determinations, and the motives of its conduct, is neither more nor less than a huge and impudent fraud, under which it has hitherto succeeded in cloaking the nakedness of its own preposterous pretensions. This character of the Papal power, and of its policy, requires to be thoroughly understood, in order to appreciate the recent transition from monarchical to democratic sympathies and manifestations. To the common observer, that transition wears the appearance of a total change in the character of the Papacy itself, which, however, in reality has not undergone any change; on the contrary, the consistent acting out of that character required that, under the altered aspect of the political world, the Papacy, which had hitherto been the partisan of monarchy, should henceforward become the abettor of democracy. Neither the one nor the other has in the eyes of the Papacy any value, beyond that of being a convenient tool for the assertion and maintenance of Papal supremacy; the

preference, therefore, to be given to the one or the other, depends simply on the question, whether of the twain shall promise to be the readier and the more efficient tool.

And as it is incorrect to say that the Papacy has undergone any real change, so it is an erroneous notion to suppose that the transition from monarchical to democratic professions and alliances, which the very consistency of the character of the Papacy required, was a sudden one. The official announcement of such a transition took the world by surprise, it is true; but the progress of the Papacy itself to the point at which the announcement became at once necessary and expedient, has been any thing but rapid. Bearing in mind that the Papacy never supported monarchy on any other ground than this, that it was a convenient and efficient tool for the maintenance of its own power, and reviewing the history of the relations between the Papacy and the sovereigns of Europe within the last hundred years, the causes of the recent divorce between monarchy and the Papacy will be found to be of a much more ancient date than a superficial observation might lead us to suspect. The feeling of the European courts towards the Papacy, which, after a long resistance on the part of the latter, effectually asserted itself after the death of Clement XIII., and forced Ganganelli on the Papal chair, had its origin in the disgust with which the sovereigns had begun to view the part which they were made to play in the political game of the Papacy, and their consequent determination no longer to suffer themselves to be made its tools. From that time forward monarchy was regarded by Rome in the light of a broken reed, which might as easily pierce as sustain the hand that leant upon it; and if at that time another power had appeared on the stage with which it would have been possible for the Papacy to ally itself, there can be no doubt that such an alliance would at once have been embraced. The essentially anti-papal as well as anti-religious character of the first French revolution, however, presented no temptation to the Papacy to look in that direction; and after the ill success of the experiment which it made in recognizing and anointing the French usurper, it was not surprising that when the restoration of legitimacy on the different thrones of Europe was accompanied by religious professions, however vague, and a tone of deference towards Rome, however ambiguous, the Papacy should for a time cherish the hope that the effects of the revolutionary hurricane which had passed over Europe, would lead the sovereigns, from a regard to their own interests, to resume towards the occupant of the chair of St. Peter's the attitude of dutiful sons of the Church. While the restoration of the Jesuit Order gave evidence of the intensity

with which the Papacy followed up the hope that, to use the words of Cardinal Gonsalvi, "the Church was about to be reinstated in all that she had been deprived of," the solemn protest against the settlement of the Congress of Vienna, placed on record by Pius VII., showed the reconciliation between the monarchy and the Papacy to be but a hollow peace, for the maintenance of which it was not to be expected that either party would make great sacrifices. The first practical proof of this was furnished by the Papacy on the downfall of the elder Bourbon branch in France, which was soon followed by the formal recognition of the new dynasty by Gregory XVI., accompanied, however, in accordance with the wiliness and habitual foresight of Papal policy, by reservations limiting the recognition to the *de facto* occupation of the French throne by Louis Philippe.

Meanwhile the progress of democratic principles throughout Europe could not be mistaken; the development, which no human power could arrest, of the infidel and revolutionary ideas infused into the literature, and instilled into the popular mind, of all the nations of Europe, naturally led to this result; which was accelerated, moreover, by the appeal made by the old sovereigns of Europe to the patriotism of their people against the usurpation of Napoleon, and their subsequent refusal, when they found themselves again firmly established in the seat of power, to redeem any of the promises they had made, or to fulfil any of the hopes they had excited. Wherever the democracy acquired sufficient strength to assert itself, as in Belgium, in France, and in the Rhenish provinces of Prussia, the Papacy found in it a powerful ally against the ruling power of the state; the advantage was not overlooked by Rome, and it became more and more the fashion with ultramontane writers to rest their appeals for an increase of the power of the hierarchy upon the principle of religious liberty. It seemed natural enough to suppose, that if the temporal power could be neutralized by this appeal, the spiritual power of the Papacy would have all the freer scope to advance its own claims to dominion; and thus it came to pass by degrees, that all the Papacy demanded, was "a clear stage and no favour."

While this was the position which the Romish Church took up wherever the opportunity was afforded her of cloaking her ambitious projects under the semblance of jealousy for the preservation of civil rights and liberties, the necessity of reform pressed closely upon her at her own doors. Of all the states of Italy, ill-governed as they mostly are, there are none whose government presented a greater accumulation of anomalies and abuses than the Pontifical States; the dangers arising from this cause were such, as to induce repeated representations from

friendly powers, urging the expediency of some modifications in the civil administration of the temporal domain of the Pope; and it became daily more evident, that in the event of a revolutionary movement on the part of the Roman population, few among the European powers would feel disposed to support the Papal government, while those which might be willing, would scarcely be permitted to do so by the jealousy of rival powers. The adoption of a safe measure of reform was, therefore, the only course left open to the Papacy with any prospect of maintaining its ground at home, in the very heart of the eternal city itself.

This was the situation of the Papacy when Gregory XVI. breathed his last. Its hold upon the monarchical governments was greatly loosened; in more than one country democracy was its most promising auxiliary; and at home the adoption of a liberal policy was becoming daily more inevitable. The question which had been mooted in the lifetime of Gregory XVI., as to the expediency of openly embracing the "liberal" side in politics, came now before the Conclave for immediate decision. It was not a question that could be adjourned any longer, as it had been hitherto; the Conclave had to take its choice between adherence to the traditions of the past, and the experiment of making the ideas of the nineteenth century subservient to Papal supremacy; whichever way it decided, it was then clear that the most able and the most energetic man who represented the system to be adopted, must become the successor of Gregory XVI. The result is known. Mastaï-Ferretti became Pius IX.

His election was the signal to the "liberal" party, that is, to the democracy, throughout Europe, that its day was come. He entered with spirit upon the character of a reformer, assigned to him by the very fact of his election. Rome was drunk with joy; Europe resounded the praises of "the immortal Pius." The Papacy was once more in the eye of all the nations, as a city on an hill. The blow that had been struck appeared thoroughly successful; popularity was an incense to which the chair of St. Peter's had long been a stranger; it was all the more grateful as it rose around it in dense volumes of fragrant smoke. Through the clouds in which he was enveloped,—the admiration of Europe and the idol of Rome,—Pius IX. once more held up "the image of the beast" for the world to fall down and worship before it. His encyclic breathed the spirit of the Gregorys and the Innocents; the claims to infallibility and spiritual supremacy were never advanced in language more distinct, but along with these claims to which, as coming from the supreme head of Christendom, no good "Catholic" could object, it announced thorough-going clerical reform; and the pledge given to the political passions of

the age caused its theological arrogance to be overlooked. The following extract from that remarkable document will suffice to show how little the Papacy, while embracing the cause of political liberalism, was disposed to recede from the spiritual dominion to which it lays claim :—

"It is well known to you all, my Venerable Brethren, that in this deplorable age of ours a most fierce and formidable war is waged against the whole Catholic world by men who, banded together in criminal league, unable to endure sound doctrine, and turning away their ears from the truth, strive to drag forth from darkness all manner of monstrous opinions, which heaping up with all their might they send forth and disseminate among the people. We are truly horrified, and penetrated with the deepest grief, when we reflect upon all the prodigious errors, and the various and multiplied devices of mischief, snares, and machinations, by which these haters of light and truth, these most expert forgers of falsehood, endeavour to extinguish in every heart all love of piety, justice, and honour, to corrupt the morals, to unsettle all human and divine law, to upset, undermine, and, if it were possible, wholly to subvert the Catholic religion and civil society. For you are aware, Venerable Brethren, that these deadly enemies of the Christian name, miserably carried away by a blind impulse of mad impiety, run out to such lengths of temerity in their opinions, that 'opening their mouth in blasphemy against God[1]' with audacity altogether unheard of, they are not ashamed openly and publicly to teach, that the most holy mysteries of our faith are lying fables and inventions of men, that the doctrine of the Catholic Church is contrary to the well-being and prosperity of human society; nor are they afraid to abjure even Christ and God Himself. And that they may the more easily delude the people, and deceive especially the unwary and the ignorant, and carry them away with them into their errors, they pretend that the way of happiness is known to them alone, and hesitate not to arrogate to themselves the name of philosophers, as if it was the part of philosophy, whose sole business is to investigate the truth of nature, to repudiate what the Sovereign and most merciful God, who is Himself the author of all nature, has in His singular kindness and compassion condescended to reveal unto men, in order that they may attain true happiness and salvation. Hence they cease not with preposterous and most fallacious argumentation to appeal to and extol the power and excellence of human reason against the most holy faith of Christ, and with most audacious babbling affirm it to be contrary to human reason. Than which certainly nothing can be thought of or invented more insane, more impious, or more repugnant to reason itself. For although faith is above reason, yet there can never be found between them any real dissonance or disagreement, as they both spring from one and the same fountain of immutable and eternal truth, which is the Most High God Himself;

[1] Rev. xiii. 6

and mutually assist each other; so that right reason demonstrates, maintains, and defends the truth of the faith; and faith frees reason from all errors, and wonderfully illuminates, confirms, and perfects it by the knowledge of Divine things. And by no less a fallacy, Venerable Brethren, those enemies of Divine revelation, lavishing excessive praises upon human development, would introduce that development with most audacious and sacrilegious daring into the Catholic religion; as if religion itself were the work, not of God but of man, or a philosophical device which may be perfected by human methods. Most aptly to those wretched madmen does that reproach apply which Tertullian deservedly addresses to the philosophers of his time, 'who propounded a Stoic, a Platonic, a Dialectic Christianity [2].' And certainly since our most holy religion was not devised by human reason, but mercifully revealed to men by God, every one must readily understand that religion itself derives all its force from the authority of God Himself speaking, and cannot ever be, either deduced from human reason, or perfected by it. Human reason must, indeed, lest it should be deceived, and fall into error in a matter of so great moment, diligently inquire into the fact of Divine revelation, so as to be certain that God has spoken, and to render unto Him, as the Apostle most wisely teaches, 'a reasonable service [3].' But who is or can be ignorant, that in God speaking we are to have all faith, and that nothing is more consonant to reason itself, than to acquiesce in, and firmly adhere to, those things which are ascertained to have been revealed by God, who neither can be deceived, nor can deceive.

"And how many, how wonderful, how splendid arguments are at hand, by which human reason must be absolutely and most clearly convinced, that the religion of Christ is divine, and that 'every principle of our doctrine takes its root from above, from the Lord of heaven [4];' and that therefore there is nothing surer, more certain, or more sacred, or resting on firmer foundations, than our faith. For this faith, the rule of life, the guide to salvation, expelling every vice, fruitfully begetting and cherishing every virtue, being confirmed by the nativity, the life, death, and resurrection, the wisdom, the miracles, and the prophecies of its Divine author and finisher Christ Jesus, resplendent on all sides with the light of heavenly doctrine, and enriched by the treasures of heavenly riches, most celebrated and illustrious by the predictions of so many prophets, the splendour of so many miracles, the constancy of so many martyrs, and the glory of so many saints, setting forth the wholesome laws of Christ, and gaining daily new strength even from the most cruel persecutions, has passed through the whole world, by sea and by land, from east to west, with only the standard of the Cross; and having defeated the false idols, dispelled their darkness, and triumphed over every kind of enemy, has illuminated all people, tribes, and nations, however savagely barbarous, and however different in their character, habits, laws, and institutions, with the light of Divine knowledge, and subdued them under the

[2] Tertull. de præscript. c. viii.
[3] Rom. xii. 1.
[4] S. Joann. Chrysost. Hom. i. in Isai.

easy yoke of Christ Himself, preaching unto all peace and good-will. All which shines forth on all sides with such brightness of Divine wisdom and power, that the mind and understanding of every one must readily perceive the Christian faith to be God's work. Human reason, therefore, clearly and plainly apprised by these most splendid as well as most solid arguments, that God is the author of that faith, can go no further, but casting aside and putting away altogether every difficulty and doubt, must yield to it all obedience, being well aware that whatever this faith proposes to men to be believed and done, has been delivered by God Himself.

"Hence also it plainly appears in how great an error they are entangled, who, abusing reason, and esteeming the oracles of God as the work of man, have the temerity of attempting to explain and interpret them according to their own judgment; whereas God Himself has appointed a living authority, which should teach and establish the true and legitimate sense of his heavenly revelation, decide all controversies of faith and manners by an *infallible* judgment, to the end that the faithful may not be "carried about with every wind of doctrine by the sleight of men and cunning craftiness." Which living and *infallible*[5] authority flourishes only in that Church, which being built by the Lord Christ Himself upon Peter, the Head, the Prince, and the Pastor of the whole Church, whose faith He promised should never fail, has continually its legitimate pontiffs tracing their origin uninterruptedly from Peter himself, seated in his chair, as heirs and defenders of his doctrine, his dignity, his honour, and his power. And forasmuch as where Peter is, there is the Church[6]; and Peter speaks by the Roman pontiff[7], and constantly lives and exercises judgment in his successors[8], and ministers to those that seek for it the truth of the faith[9]; therefore the Divine oracles are to be received absolutely in the sense which has been held and still is held by this Roman See of St. Peter, which being the mother and mistress of all the Churches[1], has always preserved the faith delivered by the Lord Christ entire and inviolate, and taught it to the faithful, showing unto all the pathway of salvation and the doctrine of incorrupt truth. For this is that chief Church from which the unity of the priesthood has sprung[2]; this that metropolis of godliness in which is to be found the entire and perfect stability of the Christian religion[3]; in which the principality of the Apostolic See has always flourished[4]; to which, on account of its superior pre-eminence, all the Church, that is, the faithful in all the world, necessarily must have recourse[5], with which whoever does not gather, scattereth[6]. We,

[5] The italics are in the original.
[6] S. Ambros. in Psalm. xl.
[7] Concil. Chalced. Act. ii.
[8] Synod. Ephes. Act. iii.
[9] S. Petr. Chrysolog. Epist. ad Eutych.
[1] Concil. Trid. Sess. vii. de Baptis.
[2] S. Cyprian. Ep. lv. ad Cornel. Pontif.
[3] Litter. Synod. Joann. Constant. ad Hormisd. Pontif.; et Sozom. Hist. lib. iii. c. 8.
[4] S. August. Ep. clxii.
[5] S. Iren. lib. iii. c. Hæreses, c. 3.
[6] S. Hieron. Ep. ad Damas. Pontif.

therefore, who have by the unsearchable judgment of God been placed in this See of truth, earnestly stir up, in the Lord, your excellent piety, Venerable Brethren, that with all care and diligence ye endeavour constantly to admonish and exhort the faithful committed to your charge, that adhering firmly to these principles, they never suffer themselves to be deceived and led into error by those who, having become abominable in their imaginations, labour under pretence of human development to destroy the faith, and impiously to bring it into subjection to reason, and to pervert the oracles of God; nor are afraid to offer the greatest injury to God Himself, who by His heavenly religion has condescended to provide most mercifully for the welfare and salvation of mankind.

"Furthermore you are well aware, Venerable Brethren, of the other monstrous errors and frauds, by which the children of this world attempt most fiercely to make war upon the Catholic religion, upon the Divine authority of the Church, and upon its laws, and to tread under foot the rights both of the spiritual and the temporal power. Of this kind are the criminal machinations against this Roman See of St. Peter, on which Christ has built the invincible foundation of his Church; of this kind those clandestine sects which have emerged from darkness for the ruin and devastation both of Church and State, and which have been condemned by repeated anathemas, by the Roman Pontiffs our predecessors, in their Letters Apostolic [7], which We, in the plenitude of Our Apostolic power, confirm and order to be diligently kept. This is the object of those most pernicious Bible Societies, which, renewing the old artifice of the heretics, cease not gratuitously to impart unto, and to obtrude upon, men of all classes, even the ignorant, in very large quantities, and at an immense expense, the books of Holy Scripture, translated, against the most holy rules of the Church, into all the vulgar tongues, and often interpreted by perverse explanations; to the end that, rejecting the Divine tradition, the doctrine of the Fathers, and the authority of the Catholic Church, all may interpret the oracles of the Lord according to their own private judgment, pervert their sense, and so fall into the greatest errors. Which societies Gregory XVI., of blessed memory, into whose place We have, though unequal to him in merit, been chosen, following the examples of his predecessors, reprobated by his Letters Apostolic [8], and which We likewise hereby condemn. Of this kind is that horrible system of indifference in all matters of religion, greatly repugnant even to the natural light of reason, whereby those deceivers, abolishing all distinction between virtue and vice, truth and error, honesty and turpitude, falsely affirm that men may obtain eternal salvation in the worship of any sect whatever, as if there ever could be any fellowship of righteousness with unrighteousness, any communion of light with darkness, any concord of

[7] Clemens XIII. Const., *In eminenti;* Bened. XIV. Const., *Providas;* Pius VII. Const., *Ecclesiam a Jesu Christo;* Leo XII. Const., *Quo graviora.*

[8] Gregor. XVI. in litteris Encyclicis ad omnes Episcopos, quarum initium *Inter præcipuas machinationes.*

Christ with Belial. Of this kind is that most disgraceful conspiracy against the holy celibacy of the clergy, which, alas! is countenanced even by some ecclesiastics, who, miserably unmindful of their own dignity, suffer themselves to be overcome and enticed by the blandishments and allurements of lust. Of this kind that perverse method of teaching, especially the philosophical sciences, which lamentably deceives and corrupts the unwary youth, and causes it to drink the gall of the dragon out of the cup of Babylon. Of this kind the nefarious doctrine called *communism*, which is wholly opposed even to the law of nature, and which, being once admitted, the rights, goods, properties of all, yea, even human society itself, would be utterly subverted. Of this kind the machinations, sprung from the depths of darkness, of those who, being inwardly ravening wolves, creep about in sheep's clothing, with a false and fraudulent appearance of purer piety, severer virtue and discipline, and a show of humility; who captivate by flattery, bind with soft fetters, and secretly kill, turning away men from all religious worship, and slaying and tearing the sheep of the Lord. Of this kind, lastly, to pass by other things well known and understood by you, is that most dreadful plague of volumes and tracts which fly about in every direction, and teach men to sin; which being cleverly written, and full of fallacy and artifice, and distributed at an immense expense in every place to the destruction of Christian people, disseminate every where their pestilent doctrines, deprave the minds and hearts especially of the unwary, and do the greatest injury to religion.

"To this inundation of errors, diffused in every direction, this unbridled licence of thinking, speaking, and writing, it is to be attributed that morals have become deteriorated, the most holy religion of Christ is despised, the majesty of Divine worship is impaired, the power of this Apostolic See is called in question, the authority of the Church is overthrown and brought into ignominious bondage, the rights of the Bishops are trodden under foot, the sanctity of marriage is violated, the rule of every power undermined, and so many other injuries are inflicted, both upon Church and State, over which we have to weep in common with you, Venerable Brethren. Wherefore at a time and under circumstances so critical for the cause of religion, We being anxiously concerned for the safety of the universal flock of the Lord, committed to Us by God, shall, as becomes Our Apostolic Ministry, shrink from no daring and no effort whereby We may, to the utmost of Our power, conduce to the welfare of the whole Christian family[9]."

We shall not stop to criticise the form of the document, from which this extract is taken; the bombast which it substitutes in the place of eloquence, is its least, though not its least conspicuous fault. The object for which we have transferred a portion of its contents *verbatim* to our pages, is to bring into

[9] *Ami de la Religion*, t. cxxxi. pp. 583—592. The Encyclic bears date of November 9, 1846, within five months of the election of Pius IX., and the day after his taking possession of the Apostolic See in the Church of St. John of Lateran.

full view the spiritual arrogance which pervades it; the unhesitating effrontery with which the distribution of the Holy Scriptures and of religious tracts is lumped together under the same head of offence against religion and morals with the blasphemies of rationalism and the impurities of socialism; the adoption and re-enactment of the sentences of condemnation pronounced by former popes against Protestant communions and against Bible Societies; the unmitigated assertion of the spiritual supremacy of the Roman See, put forth obtrusively, in the most offensive terms, carefully collected for this purpose from the storehouse of Romish controversy. To expect from the author of this document measures of reform with a view to purge the Roman Church of the defilement of her manifold corruptions, measures of conciliation towards other communions with a view to heal the breaches and schisms of Christendom, or an abatement of the hierarchical claims preferred by the Roman Church in the proudest days of her power and supremacy, would be the height of ignorance and folly. It is evident, therefore, that if the same man who from the chair of St. Peter's holds this language in the face of Universal Christendom, professes a political creed different from that of his predecessors, such a change is to be attributed not to any change in the views or aims of the Papacy, but simply to a persuasion that a different line of politics will, more effectually than that hitherto pursued, secure the one great purpose which Pius IX. has at heart, no less than Gregory VII. or Innocent X., viz. the spiritual sovereignty of Rome. Instead of expecting any relaxation of the claims formerly preferred by the Romish hierarchy, we shall, on the contrary, be prepared for a re-assertion of those claims with a vigour proportionate to the supposed increase of power arising from the adoption of a political system in unison with the spirit of the times. And so, in truth, we find it; for after exhorting the bishops to vigorous exertion for the maintenance of the "Catholic" Church, and for the discomfiture of the designs of all its opponents, the encyclic acknowledges that the task assigned to them cannot, in such times as the present, be accomplished without much difficulty and danger, and invites them, nay "entreats and adjures" them, to "have recourse with all boldness and confidence to the see of the blessed prince of the Apostles, the centre of Catholic unity, the summit of the Episcopate, whence the Episcopate itself, and the whole authority of that office flows, as often as they may find themselves standing in need of the aid, assistance, and protection of the authority of that see[1]."

[1] *Ami de la Religion*, t. cxxxi. p. 601.

Placing by the side of this encyclic the measures of liberal reform, the amnesties, the popular exhibitions of every kind, which characterized the beginning of the reign of Pius IX., it is impossible to arrive at any other conclusion than this, that he had conceived the bold idea of restoring the supremacy of the chair of St. Peter in all its plenitude, by making its occupant the idol of the multitude. He hoped to make the democracy the foundation on which to establish more firmly and more powerfully than ever the spiritual dictatorship of Rome. Necessity had, as we have seen, originally suggested this idea; the bold character, and the sanguine temperament of Pius IX., adopted it without a sense of compulsion, and prepared to act it out with more than ordinary vigour.

The result exceeded the calculations of the Pontiff himself. He had laid himself out for gaining popularity, and so far he succeeded; but another effect was produced which he had evidently not anticipated, though it was perfectly natural, and might easily have been foreseen. Hitherto the influence of the Papacy had given to the Roman Catholic populations generally a conservative tone; this was the rule; if in some countries it was, as we have seen, otherwise, they formed an exception, arising from peculiar political complications. Even where the Romish hierarchy took its stand upon liberal principles, as in France and Belgium, it was never once suspected that the Papacy could really sympathize with liberalism; the whole was considered as a clever manœuvre, a piece of special pleading, and nothing more. The case was very different when Pius IX. placed himself in the front rank among the liberal sovereigns of Europe. By that move the influence of the Papacy was transferred from the scale of conservatism to the opposite scale of liberalism throughout Europe. In countries where, in systematic opposition to the existing government, the liberal side had been embraced by the popish clergy, and principles of freedom and equality appealed to, that which had hitherto been done on calculation and for a specific end, was now done *ex animo*, in enthusiastic imitation of Pius IX. In other countries, where the Romish population had constituted the main strength of essentially monarchical governments, that support was suddenly withdrawn from them; the good "Catholics" suddenly became indifferent citizens:—where they were intermixed with a Protestant or a free-thinking population imbued with the spirit of liberalism, they fraternized with those to whom hitherto they had been invariably opposed; where they formed the great bulk of the population, as for instance in Austria, and where in consequence the progress of revolutionary ideas had appeared morally impossible, the whole tone and spirit

of the people became changed as by magic. Conservative rulers were all at once exposed to odium of a novel kind, likely to be more pernicious in its effects than any kind of prejudice they had formerly incurred. If they were Roman Catholic, the question was asked, why did they not take example by the Holy Father? The head of the Church, the "immortal Pius," had turned reformer; and who were they, the sons of the Church, that they should attempt to contravene his benevolent conceptions, and maintain despotic forms of government after the high authority of St. Peter's successor had declared that the time was come for them to be abolished, and liberal institutions substituted in their place? If they were Protestant, the question was asked, no less forcibly, whether it became Protestant sovereigns to lag behind in the march of reform, when even the Pope, so long considered as the representative and incarnation of all that was illiberal, had placed himself at the head of the movement? In either case, the perplexed rulers had no answer to make to these inquiries. It was true, and they could not deny it, that the Pope was outbidding them in political concessions to the popular voice; it was for them to show cause, why they should not follow in his wake, if they were Roman Catholics, *à fortiori*, out of reverence for the Head of the Church; if they were Protestants, again *à fortiori*, because it was manifestly unmeet that Protestantism should be outstripped by Popery in the race of freedom. The thorough-paced "liberals," meanwhile, who had no other creed than a political one, failed not to discern their advantage, and to turn it freely to account.

How far Pius himself was carried by the enthusiasm of the moment, by the intoxication of popularity, beyond the bounds which he had originally proposed to himself, it is difficult to say: nor is there any evidence to show the precise nature of the communications which took place between him and the sovereigns of Europe, in consequence of the new attitude which he himself had assumed, and the predicament in which he had placed them. There is, however, reason to believe that remonstrances were not wanting; that Pius IX. was reproached, if he was not threatened, for the part which he had acted. A manifesto of a most extraordinary character, hardly to be accounted for without some such provocation, appeared early in the second year of his pontificate. The occasion of it was afforded by the death of the arch-demagogue of Ireland, the mighty mouth-piece at once of Popery and of sedition.

Ireland, known to us as the land where vagrancy, pauperism, and riot are bred, the very plague-spot of the empire, is surrounded in the eyes of Rome with the halo of martyrdom; it is

one of the brightest jewels in the tiara. In the spring of the year Pius IX. had, with an affectation of paternal solicitude hardly compatible with a proper regard for the title of Queen Victoria, issued his encyclic ordering prayers and collections for that portion of the United Kingdom. Preoccupied as the Roman world already was on more than one account with Irish topics, the pilgrimage of the chief agitator to the eternal city, and his death in a foreign land, could not but excite intense interest. Nothing, therefore, was more natural than that the event should be recognized at Rome in a manner suited to the nature of the case, that is, by a funeral oration; nor was there any thing extraordinary in the selection of Father Ventura, a man no less eminent for his eloquence than for his intimacy with Pope Pius, for the office of giving utterance to the sentiments of Rome on this heart-stirring occasion. But there was nothing in the circumstances connected with O'Connell to call forth any general declaration as to the proposed policy of Rome towards the European powers; and we must, therefore, conclude that the manifesto on this subject, which the discourse of the learned Theatine contained, was either a gratuitous challenge thrown out to the European governments, or that it originated in a state of feeling between those governments and the Pope which it is not difficult to guess at. Considering the station of the preacher, and his constant intercourse with Pius IX., the former supposition can hardly be entertained; and there remains, therefore, only the other, viz. that Father Ventura was "speaking advisedly," when from his pulpit he aroused the attention of all Europe by his famous declaration of the alliance to be accomplished between the Papacy and the democracy.

"The emperors," the celebrated orator said, "who, after embracing Christianity, refused to comprehend Christianity, who dared to continue a system of Pagan despotism over the Church, were left in the lurch by the Church; they sank down to that low level which has procured for the records of their reigns the title, 'History of the Low Empire;' and they vanished from the political stage without heirs and without successors. The Church, which despises none, but seeks all, whose business it is not to cast away, but to gather, and to sanctify whatever has power and life, then turned to the barbarians whose hands had executed justice upon the baseness and blood-guiltiness of the Roman empire; she washed their hands with a little water, she anointed their foreheads with a little oil; and so accomplished the miracle of a Christian monarchy. If ever, therefore, their successors, surrendering themselves to the action of the Pagan and essentially despotic element, should renounce the Christian element, whose essence is freedom and love, and the doctrine of the religious liberty of the

nations, and the independence of the Church, the Church will be able to do without them; she will, perchance, turn towards the democracy, baptize that wild matron, Christianize her, as she formerly Christianized the barbarian; she will acknowledge one and another of her sons whom events have raised to the throne, set upon his forehead the mark of divine consecration, and say to him, 'Rule thou;' and he will rule, in spite of his plebeian origin. For there is no other stay, or salvation, or defence, or chance of duration for any government, except by giving to the Church her freedom, and by treating the nations, and respecting them, as the Sons of God[2]."

This demi-official announcement of what the Papacy might do, if the sovereigns of Europe were not prepared to follow the example set them by the Pope himself, was not calculated to soften the effects of the previous demonstrations of liberalism on the part of Pius IX. The liberals appealed with more confidence than ever to the sanction of the Pope in behalf of the new ideas which were to govern the world. So universal did this opinion become, and so inconvenient the use which was made of the name of *Pio Nono* by political and religious radicals of every shade, that the Pontiff felt himself called upon, in self-defence, officially and publicly to protest against the supposition that his sympathies were with the movement party, and to separate himself, as far as words could do it, from the radicalism with which he had unwarily identified himself, in the hope of using it as a tool for his own ends. This he did in the memorable Allocution of December 17, 1847 (No. 2 at the head of this Article), in which he says:—

"We have to express to you, Venerable Brethren, the extreme surprise which has penetrated us in receiving a writing composed by a man invested with an ecclesiastical dignity[3], and published in print; for this man, speaking in the book in question of certain doctrines which he calls the traditions of the churches of his country, and by which it is intended to restrict the rights of this apostolic see, has not hesitated to assert that these traditions are highly esteemed by us. But far

[2] English Review, vol. viii. p. 250.

[3] Who the party here alluded to is, does not appear. The *Ami de la Religion*, some time after the publication of the Allocution, contained the following mystification on the subject:—"There is in the last Pontifical Allocution a passage in which the Holy Father disavows certain assertions of a writing published by a person 'invested with an ecclesiastical dignity,' whom his holiness does not designate otherwise than by this general description. This passage has given rise to many commentaries: every one has set about forming his conjectures as to the writing, and as to the author to whom it was supposed that it might refer. We have, like every body else, heard more than one name mentioned; but, by making ourselves the echo of all those rumours, we should have thought ourselves wanting in respect towards the persons so designated, and guilty of an act of serious irreverence towards the august Pontiff, who has not seen fit to express himself more explicitly."

be it from us, Venerable Brethren, that it should ever have entered our mind or thought to depart even in the least degree from the institutions of our forefathers, or to refrain from upholding and maintaining the authority of this holy see in all its integrity. We do indeed highly esteem particular traditions, but only such as are not at variance with the sense of the Catholic Church; but, above all, we reverence and most firmly maintain those which agree with the tradition of other Churches, and especially with this Holy Roman Church, to which, to use the words of St. Irenæus, 'on account of its superior pre-eminence, all the Churches, that is, the faithful in all the world, must have recourse, and in which, by men of all countries, the apostolic tradition has been constantly preserved[4].'

"There is another point, however, on which our mind is much distressed and oppressed. It is certainly not unknown to you, Venerable Brethren, that many of the enemies of Catholic truth are in our day labouring more particularly to place every kind of monstrous opinions on a level with the Christian doctrine, or to mix them with it; and thus striving to propagate more and more that impious system of indifference in all matters of religion: and quite recently, horrible to say! men have been found to offer to our name and our apostolic dignity the insult of unscrupulously traducing us as participating in their folly, and patronising the execrable system before mentioned. For from the measures, no way inconsistent with the sanctity of the Catholic religion, which out of kindness we have seen fit to adopt in regard to certain matters relating to the civil administration of the Pontifical State, for the advancement of the public weal and prosperity, and from the pardon which in our clemency we granted, at the very beginning of our Pontificate, to some men of the same State, they have drawn the conclusion, that we are so benevolently affected towards every description of men as to believe that not only the sons of the Church, but others also, remaining strangers to Catholic unity, are equally in the way of salvation, and may attain eternal life. We cannot find language, for very horror, in which to express our detestation of this new and atrocious insult offered to us. We do indeed love all men from our very heart, yet not otherwise than in the love of God and of our Lord Jesus Christ, who came to seek and to save that which was lost, who died for all, who will have all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth, who therefore has sent his disciples into all the world to preach the Gospel to every creature, proclaiming that those who believe and are baptized shall be saved, and that those who believe not shall be damned. Let then those who wish to be saved come to the pillar and ground of the truth, which is the Church: let them come, that is to say, to the true Church of Christ, which has in her Bishops, and in the Roman Pontiff, the head of them all, the uninterrupted succession of apostolic authority, which has never had any thing more at heart than to preach, and with all her

[4] S. Irenæus, c. Hæreses, l. iii. c. 3.

might to keep and maintain, the doctrine proclaimed by the Apostles, according to the commandment of Christ; which from the Apostles' age has increased in the midst of difficulties of every kind, and which, celebrated throughout the world by the splendour of her miracles, magnified by the blood of her martyrs, ennobled by the virtues of her confessors and virgins, and strengthened by the testimonies and the sage writings of her fathers, has flourished and still flourishes in every region of the earth, and shines forth in the perfect unity of the sacraments of the faith, and of her holy discipline. We who, however unworthy, are seated in this Supreme Chair of the Apostle Peter, in which the Lord Christ laid the foundation of this His Church, shall never shrink from any trouble or labour in order to bring those who are in ignorance and error, by the grace of Christ Himself, to this only way of truth and salvation. And let all our opponents remember, that heaven and earth will pass away, but that not one of the words of Christ can ever pass away, nor can any change ever be made in the doctrine which the Church has received from Christ to keep, to defend, and to preach[5]."

This is sufficiently explicit to remove all doubt as to the determination of Pius IX. to maintain both the exclusive character and the usurped supremacy of the Roman Church; and effectually purges him from all suspicion of aspiring to the character of an ecclesiastical peacemaker and reformer throughout Christendom. He is not content, however, with this; he feels it due to himself to record his reprobation of the sympathy which the radical victories in Switzerland had met with among the liberal party in the Eternal City itself:—

"Moreover," he adds, "we cannot but express to you, Venerable Brethren, the bitter grief with which we were overwhelmed, when, a few days ago, there were found in this our beloved city, the citadel and centre of the Catholic religion, a few, though but very few, almost insane persons, who casting aside the very feelings of humanity, have not been afraid openly and publicly to triumph on account of that most melancholy civil war which has recently broken out among the Swiss, to the great disgust and indignation of the other citizens of this our city. Over that fatal war we mourn from our very heart, not only because of the blood of that nation which has been shed, the fratricidal slaughter, the atrocious, lasting and distressing discord, hatred and dissension, which usually are rife among the people, in consequence especially of civil wars, but also on account of the injury which, as we have heard, has thence occurred to the Catholic cause, and will, we fear, yet accrue; and lastly, on account of the deplorable sacrileges which were committed at the outset of the conflict, and which our soul shudders to recount[6]."

[5] *Ami de la Religion*, t. cxxxvi. pp. 24—26.

[6] *Ibid.* t. cxxxvi. p. 27.

The high tone taken by Pius IX. in this allocution was not destined to be long sustained. A storm was at this very time brewing at Rome, which swept down before it in rapid succession all the ancient barriers behind which he fancied himself secure, and able to decide what he would, and what he would not, concede to the popular will. Two points more particularly had taken possession of the public mind; one the demand for a regular constitution, the other the determination to procure the expulsion of the Jesuits from Rome. In reference to the former point the Pope had, as far back as the 15th of November, been pressed by the *consulta*, a body created by himself in the course of his reforms, for farther concessions, with a view to give to the political government of the Pontifical States a more secular character. The answer of Pius was equally expressive of his sense of disappointment at the insatiable demands of the liberal party, and of his resolve to make a stand against them:—

"With a view to the public good, I have from the first moment of my elevation to the pontifical chair, done, according to the counsels with which I was inspired by God, all I could, and am still ready, with God's assistance, to do all I can, in future,—yet without ever abating one jot of the sovereignty of the pontificate; as I have received it full and entire from my predecessors, so am I bound to transmit this sacred deposit to my successors. I call my three millions of subjects to witness, I call all Europe to witness, of what I have done hitherto, in order to draw near to my subjects, to unite them to myself, to make myself acquainted with their wants, and to provide for them. It is specially for this purpose of becoming acquainted with their wants, and making provision for the exigencies of the state, that I have called you together as a permanent council; for the purpose of taking your advice in case of need, as a help to me in forming my sovereign determinations, on which I shall consult my own conscience, and with a view to make it the subject of conference with my ministers and with the Sacred College. It would be a great mistake to give any other character to the functions which you are about to discharge; to see in the council of state which I have just created, the realization of utopian theories, and the germ of an institution incompatible with the pontifical sovereignty[7]."

Notwithstanding the decided tone which the Pontiff thus assumed in the middle of November, the year did not close without a farther concession; if that can be called concession which was extorted from him by popular agitation. On the 27th of December his *fête* came round, and that day which the year before had been a day of enthusiastic acclamation throughout

[7] *Ami de la Religion*, t. cxxxvi. p. 427.

Rome, was on the present occasion turned to a very different account. There was a demonstration, indeed; but it bore no longer the same loyal character; a mixed multitude with torches and banners ascended the Quirinal; the Pope's *fête* still furnished the pretext for the procession, but its deportment indicated a great change of feeling among the people, and on the appearance of Pius on the balcony, the cries, "*Viva Pio Nono*" were intermixed with others of a less grateful kind. The result was, that on the 29th of December a *Motu proprio*[8] was published, containing a scheme of organization for a council of ministers, assimilating the government of the Pontifical States more nearly to that of secular states, and leaving it open to the choice of the Pontiff from time to time, whether the different ministries should be filled by laymen or ecclesiastics, with the sole exception of the ministry of foreign affairs, which was always to be filled by a cardinal, and the office of secretary of the council, likewise vested in a cardinal. At the same time, the Pope refused to show himself to the people on the first of January, when a similar assemblage took place as on the 27th of December, and it was not till the following day, and after the Senate had published a proclamation exhorting the Romans to confidence and loyalty towards the person of the Pontiff, that he was prevailed upon by the earnest entreaties of the President of the Senate once more to present himself to the crowd gathered on the Quirinal. He did so, deprecating at the same time the continuance of these assemblages, as being calculated to retard rather than accelerate the progress of reform. The reception he met with was on the whole favourable, in consequence of the *Motu proprio* relative to the organization of a ministerial council; but cries of "*Down with the Jesuits*," mingled with the acclamations of the people. A month, however, passed away in comparative tranquillity; the wheels of the new political machine which Pius IX. had called into existence, began to revolve with something like regularity, when a fresh cause of excitement gave a new impulse to the movement party. Several of the neighbouring princes of Italy had been induced, under a greater or less degree of compulsion, originating in the first instance in the example set by Pius IX., to grant constitutions to their subjects; and these being framed upon the model of the French Charter, and of a more popular character than the reforms hitherto introduced in the Pontifical States, now reacted upon them. The movement of Austrian troops into Italy, for which the death of Maria-Louisa and the position of the Duchies of Parma and Modena furnished the pre-

[8] This *Motu proprio* is given in the *Ami de la Religion*, t. cxxxvi. pp. 89—94.

text, while ulterior designs were more than suspected, added fuel to the fire; and after several days of excitement, during which fresh gatherings of the people took place, and cries of "*Down with the Ministers*," were repeatedly uttered, the Pope was induced to make an appeal to the loyalty of his people in a proclamation, dated February 10th, 1848. In this document he promised that the civil institutions which he had of his own accord created, were to be further developed and brought to perfection, with this only reservation, that nothing should be done that was to the prejudice of the Church. After pointing out the progress already made, and indicating some measures then under consideration, Pius IX. adverted to the supposed danger of foreign invasion which pre-occupied the minds of the Romans at the time; and assured them that there was not the slightest reason to apprehend any real danger to the popular institutions of Rome, and of other Italian states, from the interference of foreign powers. The conclusion of the document is remarkable, from the tone it took with regard to the united cause of Italy, a new feature in the revolutionary career of Pius:—

"What danger, indeed," he exclaims, "can threaten Italy, while a close bond of confidence and gratitude, unimpaired by any violence, shall unite the strength of the populations with the wisdom of the princes, and the sanctity of right! As for ourselves, above all, We, the Head and Sovereign Pontiff of the most holy Catholic religion, would have to defend us against any unjust attack, numerous children, who would support the centre of Catholic unity, as their paternal house.

"It is a great gift of God, amidst all the gifts which He has showered down on Italy, to have three millions of subjects with two hundred millions of brothers of every nation and language. This has in other days, and in the midst of the confusion of the whole Roman world, constituted the safety of Rome, and prevented the ruin of Italy from being completed. This will always be its protection, as long as this apostolic chair shall stand upright in the centre of the Peninsula.

"Bless, then, Italy, O Great God! and preserve to it evermore the most precious of all Thy gifts, faith! Bless it with the blessing which Thy vicegerent humbly asks of Thee, prostrate with his face to the ground. Bless it with the blessing which the Saints to which it has given birth ask of Thee for it, and the Queen of Saints which protects it, the Apostles whose glorious relics it contains, and Thy Son made man, whose will it was that this city of Rome should be the residence of His vicegerent upon earth[9]."

For the moment, this mixture of religious and political fanaticism answered its purpose. Not only was a prospect of further

[9] *Ami de la Religion*, t. cxxxvi. p. 447.

concessions in the administration of the Pontifical States held out, but Pius had publicly identified himself with the national cause of Italy; and he had adroitly connected with the highly-popular political character of liberator of Italy the lofty pretensions of his spiritual office.

The plan of a representative government began now seriously to occupy the attention of Pius; the great difficulty was how to adapt a form of government which virtually recognized the sovereignty of the people, to the peculiar circumstances of a state, the supreme power of which was vested in the immediate and personal "vicegerent of God." The lofty tone in which Pius had insisted, but a few short months before, on the maintenance of the absolute sovereignty of the Pontiff, was by this time considerably lessened; that which he had so lately declared inadmissible, because incompatible with that sovereignty, he was now actually engaged in elaborating. And not only he had made up his mind to grant a representative government, but he felt it necessary to consult, though indirectly, the feelings of the people on the constitution of such a government. The creation of a Chamber of Representatives was comparatively a trifling difficulty, however dissonant with the theory of the Papacy; the knotty points were, what position was to be assigned in the working of the new constitution to the Sacred College, and in what manner the Chamber of Peers was to be composed. The Sacred College, being composed of members holding their appointments not during pleasure, but for life, is a body to which nothing analogous exists in other representative governments; and its action is so indispensable to the government of the Catholic Church, that either to abolish it, or even materially to alter its composition or its functions, must be wholly out of the question. In this dilemma the idea suggested itself of making the Sacred College the House of Peers of the Pontifical constitution; and with a view to ascertain how far such an arrangement might be palatable, the services of the general of the Theatines were once more called into requisition.

About the middle of February, Father Ventura, who had already been made use of for a semi-official announcement of the future policy of the Papacy towards the European courts, published two pamphlets; one relating to the Sicilian question, in which the entire separation, since effected, of Sicily from the kingdom of Naples, was advocated; the other, under the title "Opinion respecting a Chamber of Peers in the Pontifical States." In opposition to the ultra-liberals, who wished for a Chamber of Peers consisting exclusively of laymen, and to the Moderates, who proposed a mixture of prelates and laymen in the upper house, Father Ventura

argued that the only appropriate body to be interposed between the representatives of the people and the Sovereign was the Sacred College, which was the natural House of Peers in the States of the Church. The pamphlet was confessedly thrown out as a feeler, and it answered its purpose; for the suggestion which it contained met with general disfavour, and the result was that the project was abandoned.

It was a fortunate circumstance for Pius IX. that these discussions had arisen, and that the draft of a constitution had made considerable progress in his hands, when on the 5th of March the intelligence arrived at Rome that at Paris the republic had been proclaimed. This news, as might have been expected, threw Rome into a state of the greatest excitement; assemblages of the people were again formed, but the Pontiff prudently refused to put himself in personal communication with a multitude over which the events of December and February had taught him that he no longer possessed the control of an unbounded popularity. It was therefore arranged that the wishes of his faithful people should be presented to him in the constitutional way by the Senate of Rome. The address of the Senate, and the reply of the Pope, speak for themselves. The former ran as follows:—

"The recent events in France are calculated to exercise the greatest influence over Europe, and especially over Italy.

"The subjects of your holiness, your friends and the friends of the throne, deeply preoccupied by those events, feel themselves called upon to express to you their fears and their hopes.

"In order to give a wise direction to the movement of the political passions which under existing circumstances cannot fail to manifest themselves, your subjects consider the speedy publication of a constitution indispensable, which shall correspond in a liberal manner with the institutions of the other states of Italy. All the forces of the nation must be united to defend order within, and independence without.

"If public opinion had already before unanimously demanded a homogeneous, compact, and liberal ministry, equal to the emergency, this requirement has now become urgent in the extreme. Every delay would entail pernicious and irreparable consequences, from which your generous soul has always recoiled.

"Men capable of sustaining such a weight, and possessing the public confidence, are not wanting among the laity of your states, and public opinion has already pointed them out to your choice.

"You who, in blessing Italy, have before the face of the world associated its cause with that of religion, will understand that your temporal power is closely united to the destinies of our common fatherland. It will be the greatest glory of your pontificate, to have been able to save Italy from the ills with which she is threatened by the storms that are gathering in Europe, and at the same time, while pre-

serving order within, to have laid the foundation of her liberty and recovered her independence."

To this address Pius IX. replied in the following terms :—

"The events which follow or rather hurry on each other, are a sufficient justification of the demand which you have made upon me. Everybody knows that I am actively engaged in giving to the government the form which your lordships call for, and which the people require; but everybody understands the difficulty of such an enterprise.

"What in a secular state can be done over-night, requires in the Pontifical government mature examination, since it is extremely difficult to trace out the exact line which separates the two powers. I flatter myself, however, that in a few days my labours will be completed, and the constitution published.

"May God bless my desires and my arduous labours; and if their result is beneficial to religion, I shall fall upon my knees before the crucifix, to give thanks for all the events which He [Qy. the crucifix?] has permitted; and as head of the Church yet more than as temporal prince shall I rejoice, if those events turn out to the greater glory of God[1]."

The promise thus given by Pius IX. was redeemed within the shortest possible time; after two consistories, in which the Cardinals were called upon to give their advice on the subject, a constitution was published on the 15th of March, as the unanimous result of their deliberations. Its preamble, which is not the least interesting part of it, is to the following effect :—

"It had been our intention, in the development of the institutions which we had vouchsafed to our subjects, to reproduce some ancient institutions, which were long the mirror of wisdom, as it were, of our august predecessors, and which by reason of the march of time required to be adapted to recent changes in order to reconstruct the majestic edifice which they formerly constituted.

"In this course of proceeding we had arrived at the establishment of a consultative representation of all the provinces which were to have assisted our government in its legislative functions, and in the administration of the country; and we expected that the satisfactory nature of the results would have justified the experiment which we were the first to make in Italy. But since the princes, our neighbours, have judged their people ripe for the benefit of a representative government, we will not hold our people in less esteem, nor reckon less upon their gratitude, not towards our humble person, for which we ask for nothing, but towards the Church and this Apostolic See, the supreme and

[1] *Ami de la Religion*, t. cxxxvi. pp. 635, 636.

inviolable rights of which the Lord has committed unto us, and the presence of which always has been and always will be for them the source of so many advantages.

"In ancient times our parishes (*communes*) had the privilege of governing themselves individually, according to laws which they themselves had chosen under the sovereign sanction. Now-a-days, the conditions of modern civilization do not certainly permit the revival under the same forms of a state of things in which the difference of laws and customs often caused a separation between one parish and another. But we have resolved to entrust this prerogative to two Councils of upright and wise citizens, who in the one shall be nominated by ourselves, and in the other shall be deputed by all the different parts of the state, by means of a suitable mode of election. These Councils will represent the particular interests of each locality in our dominions, and bring them into harmony with that other interest, the most important of all for every parish and province, viz. the general interest of the state.

"And as in our sacred sovereignty it is impossible to separate from the temporal interest of internal prosperity, that other and more important interest of independence by which the independence of this part of Italy has been upheld, we not only reserve to ourselves and our successors the supreme sanction and promulgation of all the laws agreed upon by the Councils aforesaid, and the full exercise of the sovereign authority on those points on which the present act contains no dispositions; but we also intend to maintain our authority entire in those matters which are naturally connected with the Catholic religion and morality. We owe this to the security of universal Christendom, in order that in the State of the Church, constituted under this new form, the liberty and rights of this same Church and of the Holy See may suffer no diminution, and that there may be no example of violation of the sanctity of that religion which we are bound and commissioned to preach to all the world as the only symbol of union between God and man, as the only pledge of that heavenly blessing by which states subsist and nations flourish[2]."

The Constitution, which bears date of the 14th of March, consists of sixty-nine articles:—Art. 1, declares, that "the Sacred College of Cardinals, the electors of the Sovereign Pontiff, is his indispensable senate;"—Art. 2, establishes two legislative assemblies, a "High Council," and a "Council of Deputies;"—Art. 11, abolishes the censorship, but with a reservation of the ecclesiastical censorship established by the Canon law, which is maintained;—Art. 20, determines the six classes out of which the members of the "High Council" are to be nominated by the Pope; the first class being prelates and other ecclesiastical dignitaries;—Art. 21, gives the Pontiff the right to appoint the President and two Vice-presidents of the High Council, or, if he pleases, to

[2] *Ami de la Religion*, t. cxxxvi. pp. 729, 730.

appoint a Cardinal to the presidency;—by Art. 33 and 34, all laws relating to civil affairs, to the administration and government, require to be voted by the two Councils, and to be sanctioned by the Pontiff;—Art. 36, exempts all ecclesiastical or canonical matters from the operation of this statute—and Art. 38, all the "politico-religious" foreign relations of the Holy See; Art. 49, stipulates for an annual payment out of the budget, not subject to an annual vote, of the sum of 600,000 *scudi* for the civil list of the Pope, and the maintenance of the ecclesiastic establishments of the Roman Court;—Art. 52, provides that any law passed by the two Councils is to be proposed by the Pope to the Sacred College, upon whose advice the Pope gives or refuses his assent;—Art. 56—61, makes provision for the uninterupted freedom of election on the vacancy of the Holy See. With these modifications, rendered necessary by the peculiar character of the sovereignty of the Roman States, the Constitution resembles the general cast of representative forms of government of modern date, with two Chambers, one nominated by the Crown, the other elected by the people.

The spirit in which this large concession to the popular voice was made, may be gathered from the reply of Pius to a deputation which, on the day following the publication of the Constitution, waited upon the Pope to thank him for it.

"The demonstrations which I have witnessed yesterday on the part of my good people of Rome, and which I find to-day confirmed by those who are their legitimate representatives, assure me of the gratitude of my people. I receive the expression of this gratitude with infinite pleasure; and I beg that you will let Rome and the State know that *I have done all I could*, and that the whole Sacred College has willingly and unanimously agreed to it. If it does not satisfy some men who are guided by caprice rather than by reason, I believe that the people generally will be content with it. I repeat, *I have done all I could, and I can do no more*. It is my wish that my sentiments should be known to all, in order that tranquillity may be re-established, and that none of those acts may arise which in some places have disturbed public order. Liberty cannot be separated from order; order begets happiness; from order that unity is derived, which is so necessary to secure to all the quiet enjoyment of liberty, and of the fruit of the seed recently sown on the field of politics. Order is blessed by God and man, and leads to that which all desire: justice, and happiness in the families[3]."

Thus, within the short space of a year and nine months from his election we find Pius IX. conceding to popular clamour a constitution after the most approved liberal pattern, notwithstanding his previous declaration of the incompatibility of such a form

[3] *Ami de la Religion*, t. cxxxvi. p. 752.

of government with the spiritual sovereignty of the "Head of the Catholic Church." We find him conceding it as the sum of all he could do, reaching to the very utmost limit of possible concession. The torch which he brandished so freely when he ascended the Pontifical chair, has set Europe in a blaze; but the flames have also reached the Vatican itself.

Even here, however, the degradation to which the Papacy has been reduced by its ill-advised alliance with the democracy does not stop. There remain behind three several draughts which, from the cup of bitterness mixed by himself, the "Sovereign Pontiff" has had to drain. The first of these is the expulsion of the Jesuits from Rome. Originally a pupil of the Jesuits, Cardinal Ferretti has shown himself their devoted friend before, their strenuous patron since, his elevation to the supreme pontificate, and hard has he struggled to uphold them and to maintain their establishments at Rome. It was through his means chiefly, not to say exclusively, that their disastrous settlement at Lucerne, originally projected by his predecessor, was maintained at the risk of civil war and bloodshed, as the papers presented to Parliament abundantly prove; and it was not, therefore, to be expected that he would, except in the utmost extremity, abandon their cause nearer home. From the very commencement of his reign he had taken every opportunity of testifying his special favour and good-will towards them; every persecution against them on the part of their enemies elicited from Pius IX. new marks of attachment and regard. In the midst of the unpopularity to which he was subject in the last days of December, when he refused to show himself to the people, he proceeded to the Church of the *Gesu* on the last day of the year, to perform his devotions according to annual custom. When towards the end of February the animosity against them increased, he ordered a circular to be issued to the governors of the provinces, commanding them to afford to the Jesuits every protection, and informing them that both the military and the police were instructed to give them the most efficient support for this purpose; nay, as late as the 14th of March, when he had conceded all else, he endeavoured to make a stand on behalf of the Jesuits, and published a proclamation, in which he announced that if the riotous proceedings directed against them should continue, he intended to "put the fidelity of the civic guard, and of all the forces charged with the maintenance of public order to the test." But all was in vain. Within a fortnight after, he found himself compelled to enter into a private arrangement with the General of the Order, for the quiet dispersion and expatriation of its members; without brief or bull, simply by a private understanding between the Pope and the General.

Another triumph which the democracy accomplished over its foster-father *Pio Nono*, is the part which Rome has taken in spite of him in the national Italian war against Austria. The refusal to make war upon his own spiritual subjects in Germany, which he expressed most explicitly in the famous Allocution of April 29, created such a ferment in Rome, that for some time the deposition of the Pope from his temporal sovereignty appeared far from an improbable event. The Allocution itself is an elaborate defence of Pius, against the imputation that "he was the principal author of the public commotions which of late have disturbed several countries of Europe, and Italy in particular." With this object in view, he adverts to the advice given to the Papal Court from time to time by the European sovereigns, even as far back as the latter part of the reign of Pius VII., to introduce reforms into the civil administration of the Pontifical States; and represents the measures adopted by himself at the commencement of his reign as nothing more than the result of that advice. In reference to Germany, in particular, he declares that if he has it not in his power to restrain those of his subjects who choose to join the national Italian war against Austria, the instructions given to his troops never extended further than the protection of his own frontier; and he solemnly protests that being called upon to declare war against Austria, he had refused to do so, and is resolved to persist in that determination at all hazards [4].

The effect which this Allocution produced cannot be better described than in the words of Pius himself, in the proclamation which he issued on the 1st of May, with the view of allaying the public irritation.

"The words of the Allocution just mentioned have produced a commotion which threatens to break out into acts of violence, and which, not even respecting persons, but treading under foot every description of law, attempts (great God! our heart is congealed at the very thought) to stain the streets of the capital of the Catholic world with the blood of venerable persons, the innocent victims, that are designated to the blind fury of some unhappy men who will no longer listen to the voice of reason. And is this the reward which a Sovereign Pontiff was to expect for the manifold proofs of love which he has given to his people? O my people, what have I done unto thee? *Popule meus, quid feci tibi?* Unhappy men! they perceive not that besides the enormous crime with which they would stain themselves, and the incalculable scandal which they would cause through the whole world, they would only disgrace the cause which they pro-

[4] See the Allocution of which the above is an abstract at full length in the *Ami de la Religion*, t. cxxxvii. pp. 385—388.

fess to maintain, by filling Rome, the Pontifical state, and all Italy with an infinite succession of ills! And could, in such an event (which God forfend), the spiritual power which God has committed to us remain idle in our hands? Let it be thoroughly understood by all, that we feel the greatness of our dignity, and the strength of our power[5]."

This attempt of the Pope to allay the storm, partly by appealing to his former popularity and to the gratitude of his people, and partly by displaying in the distance the terror of his spiritual thunders suspended over the heads of his refractory subjects, served only to make the total prostration of the Papal power more manifest. So far from producing the desired effect, the proclamation infinitely aggravated the position of Pius himself, and of the Cardinals who were most obnoxious to the populace, as it was supposed that they were his counsellors in his resistance against the popular will. The threat of spiritual censures was treated with the utmost contempt, as a *brutum fulmen;* the Pope was compelled to leave the question of war practically in the hands of his ministry, which openly negotiated for the incorporation of volunteers from the Papal States with the troops of Charles Albert, so as to avoid, on the one hand, their being treated as freebooters unprotected by the laws of war, and, on the other hand, to prevent their participation in the war from being considered as the act of their Sovereign. By this subterfuge the official character of Pius IX. was in appearance protected both from the reproach of making war upon his sons in the faith, and from the reproach of having become a traitor to the cause of Italy; while in reality that character was depressed to the lowest level of degradation, by the total disregard shown both for his temporal sovereignty and for his spiritual authority.

Latterly, indeed, he has in some measure recovered his popularity; but the means by which this result has been brought about, is the last and the most humiliating feature in the position to which Pius IX. is reduced. The loyalty of the Roman people towards him who so lately was the admiration of Europe and the idol of Rome, actually hangs upon the breath of—the Abbé Gioberti! A few months ago a refugee in Switzerland, now President of the Chamber at Turin, this clerical agitator has proceeded to Rome for the purpose of re-establishing the tottering authority of Pius IX., and preventing the defection of the "Head of the Catholic Church" from the cause of Italian nationality.

The Pope, precluded, ever since the Allocution of April 29, from all public expression of his sentiments,—so much so that

[5] *Ami de la Religion*, t. cxxxvii. pp. 433—435.

even his proclamation of May 1st was not suffered to be posted up in Rome, or inserted in the official gazette,—is reduced to the miserable plight of placing himself under the patronage of the all-powerful Gioberti, and to put into his hands such proofs as may serve to set him right with his subjects. A private letter which Pius wrote to the Emperor of Austria, on the 3rd of May, entreating him to withdraw from the conflict, and renounce all further claim to his Italian dominions, has been communicated by the Pope to Gioberti, and by him made known to the Roman population. By the publication of this document, and the assurances of Gioberti, who protests that Pius is still the "great," the "divine" Pius, the "regenerator of Italy," a re-action in favour of Pius IX. has for the present been produced, and Rome once more re-echoes the sound *Viva Pio Nono!* But how different that cry now, from what it was in the first beginnings of his Pontificate! "How are the mighty fallen!"

Art. II.—*The Princess; a Medley. By* Alfred Tennyson. London: Moxon.

It is not with the same anticipations of passionate excitement, which thrilled the souls of those who first enjoyed Lord Byron's ardent tales, that the thoughtful admirer of poetry should expect to be transported, by the perusal of Tennyson's new poem, "the Princess." Nor must we look here for the martial vigour and lyric energy characteristic of Scott's more fortunate effusions. Even the great works of Southey—a "Kehama" and a "Roderick"—though they do indeed appear to grow in beauty the more frequently we may examine them, and develope by degrees all the characteristics of the highest art, from the very first excite our interest, and kindle our warmest sympathies. The lyric bursts of power, the impassioned outbreaks, so frequent in the two former poets named, and also in Moore, and to which they owe their popularity with the vast mass of readers, are rare indeed in Southey, who thinks more of a whole than of the separate parts, and would never sacrifice internal unity to startling effects. Yet still the poetry of Southey, though in one sense it may be said to steal upon the reader, since it is only by degrees that he learns to appreciate its highest merits, at once attracts and interests, and even excites. Not so does Tennyson's "Princess." A feeling of calm and pleasurable enjoyment is likely indeed to pervade the soul of the sympathetic reader, of him who fully enters into the poet's intentions, and has the power of perceiving his beauties; but even this may be felt but slightly on a first perusal, especially if that perusal be at all hurried, and something passionate, or pathetic, or in some degree exciting, is anticipated. Nor can we undertake to affirm that there is any antecedent reason derived from Tennyson's lyric effusions, from which his readers should be prepared for a chastely elegant and tasteful, but cold and unimpassioned, strain. This, however, we undoubtedly have before us in "the Princess." The tale narrated, though of course improbable to the last degree, or rather impossible, founding its principal incidents (as it does) on the existence of a Female University, is in itself rather interesting than otherwise; certainly amusing. Nevertheless, probably no reader has been excited by this narrative. The only character at all suggestive of passion of any order, is that of the Princess; and that character is too far

remote from reality, too unfeminine, and, let us add in candour, too disagreeable, to excite much sympathy in the most good-natured reader. But, in truth, the men and women introduced in this poem are only shadows, who flit to and fro, suggestive rather of ideas than of individuals, and apparently employed exclusively for the sake of the "high argument." This argument is, the just and necessary dependence, in one sense, of woman upon the stronger sex, in opposition to the theories of Mrs. Jameson and Miss Martineau; together with her moral and independent self-existence, in another sense, as the guide and helper, and not the mere shadow, of man. Perhaps there may appear to be nothing new in this; nor is there, strictly speaking: but there is an old truth, one of the very oldest, set in a new point of view, restored and revivified, and that most successfully. We must remember that writers have been found to tell us of late, that woman's destiny was to rivalize, as a race, with man, not only in the arts and sciences, but also in philosophy and in politics. Against all this Tennyson, as we understand him, protests in this poem, with great effect: not that he literally shares the sentiments and opinions to which he has yielded such forcible expression from the lips of the old king in his poem:

> "*This is fixt,*
> *As are the roots of earth and base of all.*
> *Man for the field, and woman for the hearth:*
> *Man for the sword, and for the needle she:*
> *Man with the head, and woman with the heart:*
> *Man to command, and woman to obey;*
> *All else confusion.*"

Even this, harsh as it may sound to some, we believe to be substantially correct; although general affirmations of this nature can never safely be applied in detail. Though, both as Christians and observers, we are persuaded that a certain pre-eminence of authority is due to man, and that that family is rarely happy in which the mother or mistress is superior to the father or master; though we are convinced that few women can be happy who do not in some sense look up to their husbands; we must not be understood to deny that exceptions to this rule may exist, and do exist in fact. Though "the man is the head of the woman," a superior woman may marry an inferior man, and then their positions will be to a certain degree reversed. Nay, if the more intellectual wife can love and respect the moral earnestness and truthfulness of her otherwise inferior husband, they may yet live happily together; but then she will be sure to conceal his partial inferiority, as far as possible, even from herself, as also from him,

and will be ever striving to elevate him in her own esteem. When we say, too, that man is for the field and woman for the hearth, man for the world and woman for home, we only lay down a general rule, indispensable to the welfare of the human race, but by no means question the propriety of exceptions which are also valuable in their degree. Thus the influence of woman upon literature has been upon the whole a healthful one, despite the morbid effusions of an L. E. L. and her swarm of imitators. Woman writes from and to the heart, almost always in a moral, and frequently in a religious, strain. Nay, even in science she may possibly now and then achieve great things. We cannot forget a Miss Herschel, or a Mrs. Somerville. But, despite Miss Martineau, we cannot cordially approve of female political economists, and still less of female politicians. We do think that every woman should be a Tory, in a proper sense of the word; for every woman should be a churchwoman if we could have our way, and every churchwoman should wish to preserve the Church and all those great institutions of the country which are closely connected with the Church's well-being. And, to give a still broader reason, every woman should be naturally reverent and affectionate and loyal—loyal to her God, and therefore, in a degree, though not blindly, loyal to her Queen. But then all this is, or should be, instinctive in woman's nature, and not the result of any logical process whatsoever. We would have, indeed, what Lady Psyche foretells as predestined for the future:

> "Every where
> Two heads in council, two beside the hearth;"

But we would *not* have

> "Two in the tangled business of the world;
> Two in the liberal offices of life;
> Two plummets dropt for one to sound the abyss
> Of science, and the secrets of the mind:
> Musician, painter, sculptor, critic, more!"

And yet there is good mixed with evil here, which we must not be supposed to condemn. Female painters, indeed, not being able to study models, without doing wrong to that "retinue" which is the very charm of womanhood, can never be expected to perform great things, unless in landscape-painting: from female sculptors may kind Heaven deliver us! But female musicians are essential to the cultivation of their celestial art, which partakes much of the winning sweetness and pure ethereal beauty of woman's nature: and even female critics may have their use; for

certain it is that woman feels the beautiful more quickly, and even more deeply, than man; that she is

> "Twice as magnetic to sweet influences
> Of earth and heaven,"

as the Prince says in Tennyson's poem. And, finally, in a certain sense at least, we are fully prepared to say with Lady Psyche:

> "And every where the broad and bounteous earth
> Should bear a double growth of those rare souls,
> Poets, whose thoughts enrich the blood of the world."

Let our readers (be it observed incidentally) note the rythmical beauty of this last line! But perhaps that beautiful passage towards the conclusion of "the Princess," which is amongst the finest things in the poetry of all lands and all ages, expresses the true relationship of woman to man, and that development of her mental and moral power which is consistent with her highest happiness, far better than a long essay of ours would do. We will therefore give ourselves the pleasure of quoting it.

> "For woman is not undevelopt man,
> *But diverse:* could we make her *as* the man,
> Sweet love were slain, whose dearest bond is this,
> Not like to like, *but like in difference.*
> Yet in the long years liker must they grow;
> The man be more of woman, she of man;
> He gain in sweetness and in moral height,
> Nor lose the wrestling thews that throw the world;
> She mental breadth, nor fail in childward care:
> *More as the double-natured poet each:*
> *Till at the last she set herself to man,*
> *Like perfect music unto noble words;*
> And so these twain, upon the skirts of Time,
> Sit side by side, full-summ'd in all their powers,
> Dispensing harvest, sowing the To-be,
> *Self-reverent each and reverencing each,*
> *Distinct in individualities,*
> But like each other e'en as those who love.
> Then comes the statelier Eden back to men:
> Then reign the world's great bridals chaste and calm:
> Then springs the crowning race of humankind.
> May these things be!"

We doubt not that they will be, when the statelier Eden does return; when the spirit of love and faith and knowledge descends upon the hearts of all; when the lion shall lie down with the lamb; when the Mystery of Mysteries shall be accomplished.

But yet, even then, the equality of the sexes cannot be absolute. They will not be

> "Like to like, but like in difference."

Still man will be the intellectual, even the moral, head; though woman in many things may soar above him. But we are forgetting our critical task, seeking for that distinctive purpose which is to be found in most works of the day that exhibit any claim to superiority, and which is certainly not absent from Tennyson's "Princess." We question whether works, equal in length and merit to either Scott's or Byron's poetical tales, could by any possibility be equally void of purpose, if produced at present. We are almost sure that, if they *were* thus void, they would not find a large circle of readers. Tennyson's lyrics, it may be said, have no very distinct purpose; and this is true in a degree, though their general aim certainly seems to be to elevate and purify the soul: but on this very account they have taken no hold upon the general public mind. They have indeed found a large circle of readers, for the sake of their intrinsic grace and beauty; but they have not in any sense become popular. But, though lyrics may be more or less purposeless, a longer poem, to succeed, cannot be so. As an instance of this, it is sufficient to remark, that the only longer poems that have sold well within the last fifteen or twenty years have had a definite religious purpose. We look accordingly, in a new poem from such a man as Tennyson, for something more instructive than "the Corsair," more philosophical than "the Lay of the Last Minstrel;" we look for the revelation or exposition of some one important truth; and we have found it. But not being able to dwell longer on the moral bearings of the poem (for in such a notice we can of necessity only indicate the train of thoughts suggested to us by its perusal), we pass to the consideration of its literary and poetical merits, which are great indeed.

Concentrated power, deep pathos, wild passion, rapid incident, startling interest, vivid reality,—none of these will be discovered here; or, if at all, in a very inferior degree. Pictorial beauty, sweet fancy, aristocratic grace, true poetic feeling, and most apt and happy language, are the main characteristics of this very charming poem, and are amply sufficient to secure its earthly immortality. Is it great? some critics have asked. A great epic it certainly is not; and a great medley would sound strange, though the "Midsummer Night's Dream" of our glorious Shakspeare may deserve that epithet. But it is at all events a *true* poem, and will live; and without seeking to classify its exact degree of greatness, the author, and the critic, and the public

may well rest satisfied with this. "Medley," the poet calls his work; and a medley it is, of "old and new," of the middle ages and the nineteenth century, of the romantic and the matter-of-fact. For this some reviewers have thought proper to condemn the work; as if the reviewer could by any possibility have the right to inform the poet what subjects he should treat of, and in what special style he should treat them. The critic may indeed prefer one style to another, and may say so; but what he has to look to is the internal unity of the work; whether or not its author's intentions have been realized. In this instance it is perfectly obvious that the poet designed from the first this charming combination of things old and new: this combination was his distinctive aim, and it is realized with a grace which probably none but himself could have attained; for Browning would have failed in ease, and there is no other poet we could name at all competent to the task. Nevertheless, the ignorant critic, with wondrous sagacity, discovers that modern civilization and ancient romance are strangely intermingled, and proceeds to regret that Tennyson was not either more decidedly humoristic or more gravely solemn, so as to make his work "all of one piece." Why it *is* all of one piece, and this wondrous unity in seeming discord is the distinctive charm of the work. This quiet conversational grace, which glides so easily and almost without perceptible change "from grave to gay, from lively to severe," this it is which is so eminently Tennysonian, and so impresses the "cachet" of its author upon the work. And perhaps the very aristocratic nonchalance, the tone, as it were, of fashionable ease and quietude, which pervades the whole poem, will secure more attention than a truly passionate inspiration would have done, which the modern vulgarism of high life might possibly stigmatize as vulgar.

We do not think it at all necessary or expedient to furnish a summary of the narrative or tale to our readers, most or all of whom, if they have not read the poem, will have read more than one account of it. But we must not omit to praise the charming Prologue or Introduction, which reminds us of the Proem to the same poet's "King Arthur," and is a model of conversational grace. Lilia is a truly sweet creation, whose being seems revealed to us in a few words:

> "A rosebud set with little wilful thorns,
> And sweet as English air could make her, she:"

Her playful scorn of us men is very bewitching:

> "'What kind of tales do men tell men,
> I wonder, by themselves?'

A half-disdain
Perch'd on the pouted blossom of her lips."

And her assertion of woman's capability of greatness, in answer to her brother's doubt, is truly characteristic.

"Where,
Asked Walter, 'lives there such a woman now?'
Quick answered Lilia, 'There are thousands now
Such women, but convention beats them down:
It is but bringing up; no more than that;
You men have done it: *how I hate you all!*
O were I some great Princess, I would build
Far off from men a college of my own,
And I would teach them all things: you should see."

And now let us to the tale itself, without lingering to dilate on the impossibility of such a tale being spoken off hand in the same peculiar tone by seven students, and passing rapidly through its pages note in turn the beauties which have particularly engaged our attention. And first, the opening portraiture of the Prince who tells the story, of his mother, "mild as any saint," and his "good father," who thought "a king a king, and picked offenders from the mass for judgment," is most happily suggestive and poetical. The Princess, too, and the princely boy's romantic worship for his chosen bride, are prettily shadowed forth. Then her refusal to keep the compact is gracefully conveyed, and most admirably depicted is the wrath of the old king, whose face

"Grew long and troubled like a rising moon,
Inflamed with wrath,"

who tore the missive of her royal father, and sware at the last,

"That he would send a hundred thousand men,
And bring her in a whirlwind."

Well and gracefully conceived is the Prince's remonstrance; and his eventual flight with his two friends to seek his coy betrothed is most happily described. Gama, the Princess's father, though not a very pleasing object of contemplation, is self-consistent and true to nature, with his

"Garrulous ease and oily courtesies."

The host's astonishment on the university boundary at the resolve of the youths to force an entrance is also well depicted. We like less the description of the strange voices heard within the university when the youths in their maiden garb at last rode into it. The

> " Clocks and chimes like silver hammers falling
> On silver anvils,"

appear to us suggestive of affectation; but we know not that we have the right to dwell on such slight specks as these, if specks they be, when we experience so much delight. And yet we must record our objection to the concluding lines of the first section, where, with a somewhat far-fetched analogy, the Prince is made to say,

> " And then to bed, where half in doze I seem'd
> To float about a glimmering night, and watch
> A full sea, glazed with muffled moonlight, swell
> On some dark shore just seen that it was rich,"

which is very artificially conceived and very awkwardly expressed. In the second section the Princess dawns upon us in all her splendour. Her beauty is poetically described. Her speech asserting woman's rights, though not very vigorous, has merit. But the Lady Psyche is here introduced to us with characteristic ease and grace;

> " A quick brunette, well-moulded, falcon-eyed,
> And on the hither-side, or so she look'd,
> Of twenty summers."

Her lecture is admirable of its kind: suggestive in its happy irony of that modern empiric philosophy which professes to unravel all things. Her discovery of her brother in his female disguise is well told; and the appeals of the three youths to her feelings, though rather lengthy, have all much beauty. One of the few passages in the poem approaching to pathos occurs here when Psyche has softened.

> " With that she kiss'd
> His forehead, and a moment after clung
> About him, and betwixt them blossom'd up,
> From out a common vein of memory,
> Sweet household talk, and phrases of the hearth,
> And far allusion, till the gracious dews
> Began to glisten and to fall."

Then comes the sweet Melissa,

> " A rosy blonde, and in a college gown
> That clad her like an April daffodilly
> (Her mother's colour) with her lips apart,
> And all her thoughts as fair within her eyes,
> As bottom agates seen to wave and float
> In crystal currents of clear morning seas."

The lectures are admirably described, with their quotations of

> "Jewels five-words-long
> That on the stretch'd forefinger of all Time
> Sparkle for ever."

And Cyril's good-humoured scorn is no less happy of its kind.

> "'They hunt old trails,' said Cyril, 'very well;
> *But when did woman ever yet invent?*'"

What say our lady readers to this?—The unamiable lady Blanche is most graphically pourtrayed. But we must on. Melissa's narrative of the discovery in the third section is very natural and very graceful. But here we are, perhaps, mainly struck by the Princess's fine speech to the disguised Prince. How exquisitely womanly and natural, through all her scorn, is the exclamation,

> "Yet will we say for children, would they grew
> Like field-flowers every where! we like them well:—
> But children die! and let me tell you, girl,
> Howe'er you babble, great deeds cannot die:
> They with the sun and moon renew their light
> For ever, blessing those that look on them."

Then the excursion is charmingly depicted: we could linger over every page, and sometimes over every line, but have not space for reference. In the fourth section are introduced two songs which have been perhaps somewhat overpraised: certainly they do not stand out from the poem by their distinctive excellence. The first, respecting "the days that are no more," is soft and smooth, but not extremely original; and the second, "O swallow, swallow," though pretty, is rather insignificant, despite the one sweet verse,

> "Why lingereth she to clothe her heart with love,
> Delaying as the tender ash delays
> To clothe herself, when all the woods are green."

There is far more poetry, and even more meaning, in the Princess's poetical comments. The discovery is unnaturally brought about by such a song as Cyril would never sing. Indeed, this strangely vulgar coarseness is a blot upon the poem. Cyril might have trolled a tavern-catch, no doubt, but not one of the order here suggested. The Princess's flight and fall are graphically pourtrayed; but the account of the Prince's saving her is somewhat overwrought. The subsequent night council and trial of the Prince are eminently poetical. Specially to be noted for picturesque propriety is the account of the Princess's female body-guard. The fifth section, with the glorious old

King's denunciations and the Prince's poetical defence of his cruel loved one, and the desperate encounter in the lists, presents much of interest, though we must content ourselves with one general word of praise. And yet we must confess that the battle-scene is somewhat confused, and appears to be overlaboured. The sixth section upon the whole pleases us the least, though it has its beauties. The Princess's exultation in her enemies' fall, whilst two of her own brothers lie dangerously, if not mortally, wounded, is positively displeasing, and the whole scene is somewhat devoid of interest. Nevertheless, Lady Psyche's grief for her child is beautifully described, and the thawing of Ida's will is finely told:

> "And then once more she look'd at my pale face:
> Till understanding all the foolish work
> Of Fancy, and the bitter close of all,
> Her iron will was broken in her mind;
> Her noble heart was molten in her breast."

The seventh and last section is one of the most beautiful. The love of Melissa and Florian is sweetly suggested, but the main interest is centred in the gradual growth of the Princess's love for the wounded and all but insensible Prince. The last interview between them, which brings about their union, is exquisitely treated. How beautifully is it said, when the repentant Ida feels the folly of her designs,

> "Her voice
> Choked, and her forehead sank upon her hands,
> And her great heart through all the faultful past
> Went sorrowing in a pause I dared not break."

And then how nobly is she cheered by the Prince in speeches, which we have already quoted in part, and from which we now need only extract these few lines, which occur after an allusion to the Queen his mother:

> "Happy he
> With such a mother!—faith in womankind
> Beats with his blood, and trust in all things high
> Comes easy to him; and tho' he trip and fall
> He shall not blind his soul with clay!"

And now we must bring our *compte rendu* to its close. The so-called conclusion, or Epilogue, is in perfect keeping with the Prologue. Having spoken, however, of the exquisite fancy displayed in the similes introduced in this poem, we must give a

few samples of them. Maintaining, that women differ as much as men from one another, the Prince says,

> "The violet varies from the lily as far
> As oak from elm."

Again, we read,

> "But, Ida, with a voice that like a bell
> Toll'd by an earthquake in a trembling tower
> Rang ruin, answer'd full of grief and scorn."

Again, an exquisite Northern image:

> "For I was young, and one
> To whom the shadow of all mischance but came,
> As night to him, that sitting on a hill
> Sees the midsummer midnight Norway sun
> Set into sunrise."

Melissa's description of the stern Lady Blanche.

> "'Tis my mother,
> Too jealous, often fretful as the wind
> Pent in a crevice."

The Princess derides

> "The woman-phantom, she that seem'd no more
> Than the man's shadow in the glass."

The dawning of love is thus delineated:—

> "Love, like an Alpine harebell hung with tears
> By some cold morning's glacier; frail at first,
> And feeble, all unconscious of itself,
> But such as gather'd colour day by day."

Here we pause, though we might multiply such samples six-fold: but have we not already shown that grace, and fancy, and choice language, and pictorial beauty, and cultivated taste, and, let us add, in general, sound sense, are combined in this charming Medley? And what more is needed? True, it is not without faults: even the rhythm is occasionally too free. A certain freedom is very agreeable, and adds to the enjoyment of such a poem: but we do not like, as a line,

> "Palpitated, her hand shook, and we heard,"—

or,

> "Strove to buffet to land in vain. A tree:"

and still less defensible is

> "Among us, all out of breath, as pursued."

The insertion of an "if" before the "pursued" in this latter line would make it read correctly. Perhaps the printer is to blame.

There are, also, occasional expressions which we cannot approve of.

> "She to me
> Was proxy-wedded *with a bootless calf*
> At eight years old,"

certainly appears absurd. Equally, or almost equally unpleasant is

> "The tops shall strike from star to star, the fangs
> Shall move the stony bases of the world."

An occasional diffuseness, too, must be complained of, accompanied by a very unnecessary obscurity, not redeemed by that concentrated power which makes us bear with the greatest of all living dramatists (if we except perhaps the German Grillparzer), —we mean Robert Browning. Still, with all its drawbacks, "the Princess" is one of the most charming poems, take it for all in all, in our own or any language, and should be recognized as such. Enthusiasm should not be reserved for the time when the poet has descended to his last earthly resting-place, and cannot rejoice in the sympathy and admiration of his fellow-men. No; let us give the living poet his full meed of praise; not indeed concealing what we may consider his defects, but proudly confessing and rejoicing in his genius. Let us not be told that this is an age devoid of poetry. So bright a galaxy of bardic stars does not indeed glitter as some five and twenty years ago, when Byron, Southey, Moore, Shelley, Coleridge, Wordsworth, Crabbe, Scott, Keats, Milman, and other immortals, were pouring forth their strains; but we have still the most graceful of all modern poets in Tennyson, and the most intensely dramatic in Robert Browning. Our living religious poets, too, may proudly assert their claims to honour: and Miss Barrett, Martin Farquhart Tupper, the author of "Proverbial Philosophy," Marston, by right of his "Gerald," and others, still vindicate in their degree the glories of the bardic line. Browning, Miss Barrett (or rather Mrs. Browning), and Tennyson, have a closer bond of union than the rest, in the combination of extreme grace with exquisite pathos. Of this pathos Tennyson has given us but little in "the Princess." Let us trust that it is reserved for future productions. What he has given, however,—and in saying this we feel that we assert much (whatever his literary adversaries may imagine),—IS TRULY WORTHY OF HIM.

Art. III.—1. *Protest against the Ministrations in Madeira of the Rev. T. K. Brown in Opposition to Episcopal Authority and in Violation of the Laws and Constitution of the Church of England. By the Rev.* R. T. Lowe, *the Chaplain licensed by the Lord Bishop of London.* Funchal, 1848. (Sold by Rivingtons, London.)

2. *Appendix to a Protest, &c. by the Rev.* R. T. Lowe. Funchal, 1848. (Sold by Rivingtons, London.)

3. *The Madeira Chaplaincy treated of, and the Supremacy of the Queen vindicated, in a Letter addressed to the Rev. R. T. Lowe, by* T. K. Brown, *M. A., British Chaplain at Madeira.* London: Hatchard, Piccadilly.

Every one knows of the great struggle in the eleventh and twelfth centuries made by the Church against lay *Investitures*, as they were called, or the scandalous attempt made by princes and other laymen to confer ecclesiastical offices without the intervention or consent of the ordinary. But few, we suppose, had anticipated that we should see the same attempt made in our own time, as we have in the cases of Bishop Hampden and the Chaplain at Madeira. For the benefit of such of our readers as have not given this question much consideration, or who have been induced to regard it as of trifling importance, we shall now offer a few remarks on the subject at issue. It is well known, then, to have been, from the first, a fundamental principle in the Church, that each bishop is paramount in his own diocese, in all spiritual matters; that in him, in fact, *alone*, the spiritual care of all the souls within the sphere of his bishopric originally lies. From Christ our Lord, the bishop of our souls, this care and responsibility was derived to his apostles, and from them to the bishops of the Church generally, who are their successors. To aid them in the effectual discharge of this duty, the early bishops had their colleges of priests and deacons, whom they ordained and kept near them *in partem sollicitudinis*, that is, to assist them and relieve them of such parts of their duty as they were competent to discharge, and as the bishop at his discretion should appoint. In process of time, when dioceses became divided and distributed into parishes, the priests no longer resided with their bishop, going forth at his bidding to discharge whatever office he thought fit to entrust them with, but were permanently fixed in the several parishes, in each of which they acted as the bishop's deputies, discharging the necessary sacerdotal functions for the benefit of the people so entrusted to them by the bishop and *in his stead*. It must be

observed that to the bishop *alone* pertained the right of *collation*, or of placing each priest in his particular parish or station, and granting him permission to exercise his office there. As time went on, pious and holy men granted endowments to these parishes for the maintenance of the priest, and built churches to the honour of God; and, as a natural result, were in many cases allowed the privilege of *nominating* or recommending to the bishop such priests as they wished to hold the benefices, and enjoy the fruits of their liberality. A priest so recommended or nominated was, after examination, if no just cause for refusing him appeared, instituted to the benefice by the bishop. This was the origin of *patronage*, and, so far, no evil effects followed: the bishop in allowing the patron to nominate, no further restricted his own plenary authority, than by undertaking to appoint his nominee in preference to another clerk, provided he were competent and fit. So far then, no infringement of the bishop's spiritual authority was made; but in time (it began with Charles Martel, in France) the lay patron came to be dissatisfied that the bishop should have this veto on his appointment, and anxious to possess the power to confer the preferment in his gift, freely, on whom he would, whether competent or incompetent, *without reference to the bishop at all: i. e.* he desired to *collate* [1] as well as to *present;* in other words, to possess the monstrous power of his own mere will, to confer upon his clerk authority to act *for the bishop* and *in his stead*, without the bishop having any voice in the matter! Against this sacrilegious assumption of spiritual authority on the part of the lay patrons, the Church stedfastly and unremittingly set herself. Hence the quarrels of the eleventh and twelth centuries. The Church all along maintaining the Gospel principle, as laid down in the 8th canon of the Council of Nismes, A.D. 1096: all who enter upon the discharge of a divine ministry otherwise than through the door of apostolic vocation and mission, are to be regarded as thieves and robbers; and subsequently in the 7th canon of Lateran, A.D. 1123, "sicut sanctis canonibus constitutum est, animarum cura et rerum ecclesiasticarum dispensatio in episcopi judicio et potestate permanent:" and in can. 18, "in parochialibus ecclesiis presbyteri per episcopos constituantur [2]."

[1] That the right of *investiture* claimed by lay-patrons was nothing more nor less than that of collation, appears evidently from the letter of pope Alexander III. to the Bishops of England. "Emersit quædam prava consuetudo, et in illis partibus inolevit, scilicet quod laici ecclesias et ecclesiastica beneficia solcant passim, *quibus vellent conferre et auctoritate sua clericos investire.*"

[2] Compare also the following synodical constitutions:

Quia in tantum quorundam laicorum processit audacia, ut, *episcoporum authoritate neglecta*, clericos instituant in ecclesiis, et removeant, etiam cum voluerint.—Lateran, A.D. 1179. can. 14. [Ut nullus

That such was the universal faith of the early fathers and councils (as the prelates at Lateran stated) has been abundantly shown by our own Bishop Jeremy Taylor in his "Episcopacy Asserted;" who in section XXXVII. of *Forbidding Presbyters to officiate without episcopal licence*, after citing a multitude of passages from the writings of the early Christians and from the canons, to prove that in the apostolic age and in the following centuries no priest could act without a particular commission and *local* designation from the Bishops, thus concludes: "This whole discourse shows clearly not only the Bishops to be *superior* in jurisdiction, but that they have *sole jurisdiction*, and the presbyters only in *substitution* and *vicaridge*."

We have lived to see this usurpation of the Bishop's prerogative again made by the civil power. Lord Palmerston claims and exercises, in the name of the Crown, the right, not alone to *nominate*, but to *institute*, or *collate*, to all foreign chaplaincies, under the Act 6 Geo. IV. cap. 87; in defiance of the prescriptive right enjoyed by the Bishops of London ever since the Reformation, of exercising jurisdiction over all English clergymen and congregations abroad. He arbitrarily deprives one chaplain, without alleging any fault or giving him any opportunity of defence, and *institutes* another, declaring "that the licence of the Bishop is not *requisite*," and that it will not in future be requested. This is certainly to cut the knot; but we believe his lordship will find that he has cut it only to tie another even less easy of solution. It is all very easy for Lord Palmerston to send chaplains abroad to officiate for English congregations, in defiance of the Bishop of London; and, in his own peculiar *poco-curante* style, think to smooth all difficulties by declaring that the Bishop has nothing to do with the matter; but will churchmen (for whose benefit, we presume, Church of England chaplains are appointed) view the matter in the same light? Will they be so easily satisfied that "continuance in the *apostles*' fellowship" is secured to them by the ministrations of a clergyman who has no other mission than that of a cabinet minister, and given, moreover, *in direct opposition* to him who sits in the *apostles*' seat? If such be, in truth, the doctrine of our Church, if she really teaches that communion with the Catholic Church is to be obtained through the Queen or her ministers, and not solely through the Bishops,

Ut nullus ecclesiasticum aliquem honorem a manu laicorum accipiat; nullus presbyter capellanus alicujus laici esse possit, *nisi concessione sui episcopi.*—Clermont, 1095. can. 15. 18.

Nullus laicus *det* vel *adimat* presbyterum ecclesiæ, *sine consensu prœsulis.*—Tours, 1096. can. 6, 7.

Nulla persona ecclesias, vel decimas, seu *quœlibet alia ecclesiastica beneficia*, det, vel accipiat *sine consensu et autoritate episcopali.*—London, 1127. can. 2.

with whom alone He has promised his presence unto the end, then we conceive all dispute with Rome is settled, and our Church is *no* Church. But, thank God, she knows no such doctrine, recognizes no *spiritual* authority save that which is derived to our Bishops through the Apostles, and, with the fathers of the first Œcumenical Council of Constantinople, "includes under the name of *heretics* those who pretend indeed to hold the sound faith, but who have separated themselves from, and formed congregations in opposition to, our *Canonical Bishops*[3]." In short, the denial of the whole divine economy of the Church is involved in the denial of this essential and inherent right of the episcopate. The cardinal point, on which the whole system hinges, is the doctrine that each Bishop is the centre of unity, the source of all spiritual authority in his own diocese; to whom each individual believer is united through the priest whom the Bishop, in the exercise of that authority, sets over him. Sever, then, the connexion between the priest and the bishop, and you sever also the connexion between the latter and those who attend the ministrations of the priest. It is idle to say that the priest is still a priest and still retains his episcopal ordination: he who denies that episcopal *mission* is requisite, must of necessity also deny the necessity of episcopal *orders:* they stand or fall together: there is the same authority and evidence to prove the necessity, of both, to valid sacraments and offices.

It remains to be seen whether the legislature will bear out Lord Palmerston in his determination not to present consular chaplains *in future* to the Bishop for examination and approval, and, to gratify the petulance of a foreign secretary, allow our countrymen abroad to be deprived of the privilege which the Act of Parliament was intended to secure to them, of having a chaplain "*regularly* employed in the celebration of Divine service, *according to the Rites and Ceremonies of the United Church of England and Ireland.*" It is true, that Act does not specifically enact that such chaplains shall be licensed by the Bishop; so neither does it say that he must have been *episcopally ordained;* but it clearly means to state, generally, that the chaplain so employed must be in the same circumstances as a clergyman similarly situated would be in England; i. e., *inter alia*, he must be ordained and licensed by the Bishop, and under his spiritual jurisdiction and control.

Consider, for a moment, the practical effects of this novel episcopate. If a question arises between the chaplain and any

[3] See act 1 Eliz. cap. 1, to show that the decisions of the first four Œcumenical Councils in the matter of heresy are received by the statute law of this country.

portion of his congregation about rites or doctrine,—and in these times how is it possible that such should *not* be the case?—who is to adjudicate? Were it not too grave and sad a matter, would it not seem simply ridiculous to conceive of Her Majesty's principal Secretary of State, in his *bureau*, gravely pondering over the orthodoxy of an obnoxious sermon. Nay, suppose him capable of such adjudication, and suppose him also resolved to support an innocent chaplain against the tyranny of an ignorant and factious majority, (which, however, after Mr. Lowe's treatment, is perhaps too much even to *suppose*,) of what avail is his support? The majority *refuse the salary;* the *Royal Supremacy*, about which such a mighty stir has been made in the present case, is set at nought; the Queen is compelled to withdraw her chaplain, and a new one is appointed. Take away the *essential* feature of an *Episcopal* Church, the necessary subordination of *all* its clergy to the Bishop, and any such congregation, notwithstanding Acts of Parliament and Secretaries of State, becomes simply an isolated assembly, associated for religious purposes, with a hired minister, their creature and servant, holding office, "not during Her Majesty's pleasure," but so long as he continues, by his obsequiousness, to please the taste of his audience, "and no longer." Who, that has read the account of the late strange and shameful proceedings in Madeira, can help calling to mind the somewhat parallel case of Micah: (Judges xvii.) "And Micah said unto him, Dwell with me, and be unto me a father and a *priest*, and I will give thee *ten shekels of silver* by the year, and a suit of apparel and thy victuals. So the Levite went in . . . and *Micah consecrated the Levite*, and the young man became his *priest*." When will men learn "that the gifts of God are not to be purchased with money;" that it is not the *name* which makes the priest!

One thing is certain; that if this iniquitous scheme of Lord Palmerston's devising be persisted in, the present state of affairs in Madeira will be multiplied; and at other consular stations, as well as at Funchal, we shall see *two* chaplains,—one appointed under the Act, and the creature of the consul and meeting; the other licensed by the Bishop, and so "sent into the Lord's vineyard by those who have public authority given unto them in the congregation to do so." (Art. XXIII.)

Mr. Lowe very properly delivered to Mr. Brown, on his first arrival in Madeira, the "Protest," mentioned at the head of this article, and which was shortly afterwards followed up by the "Appendix," &c., containing a sort of *catena* of authorities in support of the positions maintained in the Protest. In the Protest he has manfully and solidly vindicated his claim to be

regarded as the only clergyman, authorized *by the Church*, to officiate in Madeira; and, in consequence, he faithfully warns our countrymen to forbear attending the ministrations of one whom the Lord Bishop of Cape Town, when on the spot, declared to be a schismatic. The Appendix is an admirable manual of authorities on the subject of episcopal *mission*, and one which in these days ought to be in the hands of all churchmen. Especially we recommend both these little works to the attention of those who are likely to become visitors to the island: they contain simple statements of *facts*, and cannot well fail, we should conceive, to convince the reader on which side in this sad dispute lies the cause of God and His Church.

But should the reader require further confirmation of the righteousness of the cause advocated by Mr. Lowe, and further proof of the iniquity and rottenness of that of his oppressors, let him turn to Mr. Brown's "Madeira Chaplaincy treated of, and *the Supremacy of the Queen vindicated*." Of which very swelling title we shall only remark, that we wish our beloved Sovereign a better champion, should her just supremacy be ever called in question, as it certainly has not been in the present case.

The drift of Mr. T. K. Brown, in the work before us, is naturally enough to make it appear that his appointment, made *ministerially* by Lord Palmerston, was a *personal* exercise of the Royal Supremacy by the Queen; and, further, to magnify this Supremacy into a *Papacy*, and so to justify his own "anomalous and unpleasant position." This was necessarily his line: unless he can prove that the Sovereign, to use Hickes' words, is a "*Civil Pope* to the Church, having power to exempt her subjects from their spiritual obedience and subjection to her," his position is absolutely untenable. If this position be not supported by much argument or authority, it is fair to say that he, at least, endeavours to make compensation by the devoted recklessness with which he magnifies the position itself, submitting even the persons and property of churchmen to the royal will. But after straining to inflate the supremacy to the dimensions of the most intolerable tyranny, and endeavouring to make it appear that the royal supremacy, in ecclesiastical "things and causes," is nothing less than the *arbitrary will* of the Sovereign; who he declares, with some chuckling, upon the authority of that "great and shining light," Bishop Jewel, may even "slay wicked prophets, *depose bishops*, [and, therefore, he argues in a note, *à fortiori*, they may "depose a foreign chaplain, *who is but a presbyter*,"] call councils of bishops and sit with them; teach them

what to do, and punish heretical bishops;" and do many other such feats and achievements; after all this, we are told (p. 25), that "in questions touching the supremacy of the crown, it is a well-known principle in the courts of justice to ascertain, not quid voluit Rex, but quid dixit Parliament." (*Sic.*) We confess that we trembled for the clergy until this "well-known principle" came to our relief. What security have we, we said to ourselves, that our gracious Queen will not some day, just to keep the royal prerogative in exercise, take off the heads of a refractory chapter, depose my Lord of Canterbury, and, peradventure, put Lord Viscount Palmerston on his seat, or (which were a stretch of the "supremacy" we could, perhaps, have pardoned) "punish" Bishop Hampden on the treadmill for his "heresy."

We may add, that it is singular, when Mr. Brown taunts Mr. Lowe with "a want of argumentative justice," in neglecting to quote the whole of the 37th Article, and triumphantly proceeds to "supply the omission," he does not perceive that he is, in fact, completing the demolition of his own cause; inasmuch as that part of the article which Mr. Lowe omitted, and which his opponent has so kindly supplied, expressly declares: "We give to our princes . . . *that only* prerogative, &c. . . . *that is*, that they should rule all estates and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be ecclesiastical or temporal, and restrain with the CIVIL *sword* the stubborn and evil doers." We say, it is singular that he should have overlooked the emphatic manner in which the Church, by *specifying* the exercise of the *civil* sword to be a part of the regal office, denies to the Sovereign the exercise of the *spiritual* sword. Now, we suppose no one will deny that the *deposition* of a minister of Christ, though he be "but a presbyter," and the institution of another in his place, is an exercise of the *spiritual* power.

Mr. Brown's ideas of episcopal authority, as might be supposed after all this, do not run very high. "The jurisdiction which the Bishop of London has exercised over foreign chaplains," we are first informed (p. 24), "has, as you are well aware, been found to be *inconvenient*." We are *well* aware of it. "And *therefore*," he adds, "it has seemed good to the Foreign Secretary to *alter*" this "ARRANGEMENT." GOD'S own appointed form of ecclesiastical government, that "due subordination of Presbyters to *Bishops*," which Queen Anne declared to be "a *fundamental* part of the constitution of the Church of England (Appendix, p. 103,) is, in the eyes of the obsequious Mr. Brown, an "*arrangement*," to be "altered" or set aside, at the pleasure of a Foreign Secretary, when found to be "inconvenient!"

But Mr. Brown does not stop here. We are told, that "even *if* the licence of the Bishop were *legally* necessary for the due discharge of the duties of the chaplain, *you have it not.*" This surprised us,—but a very little consideration induced the conclusion, that in all probability the Bishop of London and Mr. Lowe, who both concur in declaring that the latter *has* the licence, knew more about *that* matter than Mr. Brown. The next sentence showed us that we were right; for Mr. Brown goes on to say that Mr. Lowe "*received* the licence about fourteen years ago;" and that what he means is nothing more than that the "licence *must*, by his (Mr. Lowe's) supercession, become *unavailing*." This latter reading is somewhat milder than the first; but Mr. Brown should bear in mind, that though the monosyllable "must" be an easy word to write, it rarely carries conviction to any other mind than that of the writer.

Throughout the question we meet with nothing but assertion to supply the place of argument. We are told, for instance, that the Bishop's licence *cannot* protect Mr. Lowe, *because* the Act makes the chaplain's tenure of office dependent upon Her Majesty's pleasure; and he adds, with great *naïveté*, "if it were so, [*i. e.* if the episcopal licence could protect him,] his licence would render entirely nugatory the condition *affixed* (!) to the Act." Of course it would; and of course, in common honesty and justice, it *does*. If it was Her Majesty's pleasure (as it avowedly was) that the Bishop of London should licence Mr. Lowe, and so give him that authority to act as a clergyman of the Church of England which he could not have had *without* the licence, and which no human law could give him, it was tantamount to a declaration, on the part of Government, that it was "the Queen's pleasure" that he should continue to hold the appointment whilst he continued to hold the licence. Every one knows that the licence was given by the Bishop and received by Mr. Lowe upon that understanding. "No law," says Mr. Brown, "compelled you to accept the chaplaincy in the first instance, subject to the condition of Her Majesty's pleasure for your continuance therein; but, having accepted it on these terms, surely you are bound *in honour* not to cavil at the condition, nor to endeavour in any way to evade it." We will put another case to Mr. Brown, and as nearly as may be in his own words, which may enable him to understand the bearings of the matter somewhat better. "No law compelled Lord Palmerston to request the Bishop of London's licence in the first instance, subject to the condition to which all licences by law are subject (viz., that of being held during good behaviour); but, having accepted it on these terms, surely he is

bound *in honour* not to cavil at the condition, nor to endeavour in any way to evade it."

However, we conceive that all the Act intends, by the condition *affixed* to it, is, in fact, to give the Government the power to terminate its connexion with the chaplain when it thinks fit; in other words, to cease the payment of half the salary made under the Act; in which case, of course, the chaplain would cease to be the *Government* chaplain. More than this, it seems, it cannot well intend, for the simplest of all reasons,—that more than this it cannot enforce. The Queen's "supremacy," of which Mr. Brown is so tender, has in this matter a more potent enemy in the *general meeting* than in the *Bishop*, in whom Mr. Brown has discovered a malignant "*potentate domestical* above the monarch, nay, above the law[4]." We are inclined to think, that had Mr. Lowe been as popular with the heterogeneous majority of the general meeting as, to his credit, he is unpopular and hated, her Majesty would in vain have signified her pleasure that his appointment should be cancelled, and he would have been their chaplain still. Mr. Brown might, in such case, have discovered that there be other "*potentates domestical*" besides Bishops, established, if not "*within* the realm," *without* it, which are "above the monarch and above the laws." And we can, moreover, tell him that your general meeting potentate is a sorely tyrannous one, as he may, perchance, come to feel ere long.

Mr. Brown's attempt (p. 26) to prop up his wretched cause by an appeal to the similar abuse of *Donatives*, or Peculiars, "those *scandalous* remnants of popery," as Burnet justly terms them, amounts simply to an admission that his present position is, at best, equally scandalous, and equally at variance with all ecclesiastical order and discipline. It is but a poor cause which needs such support; but the Act 3 and 4 Victoria, cap. 86, by pro-

[4] Since the above was written, we have received from the island a curious confirmation of this. It appears that a meeting had been lately held, at which a letter from Lord Palmerston was read by the Consul, *recommending* the payment to Mr. Lowe of his salary for the years 1846 and 1847. Mr. Lowe's friends—in other words, the resident *churchmen* of Madeira—having ceased all connexion with the schismatical government establishment, of course did not attend the meeting, *the object of which the Consul kept a profound secret*. By those of the anti-church party which did attend, the *Royal Supremacy*, as we had anticipated, was put in the background, and that of the general meeting maintained in all its integrity; in brief, the *recommendation of Her Majesty*, through her principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, was scouted. We are glad to find, however, that Lord Palmerston's eyes are at length beginning to be opened to the glaring iniquity of the case. Legal proceedings, we understand, (founded upon the opinions of Messrs. Turner, Q. C., and Roundell Palmer,) are about to be instituted against the noble Viscount for the recovery of the 1200*l.* of which Mr. Lowe has been deprived, owing to the line which his Lordship, illegally, as it would appear, thought fit to take in the case.

viding for the extinction of this abuse, has cut away from him even this poor standing ground. It is sad to see the glad eagerness with which the unhappy man claims the "exempt" clergymen of the archdeaconry of Richmond as his fellows, in "direct opposition to" their Bishop? (p. 26.)

There is one passage in this "Treatise" of Mr. Brown which particularly demands notice, as the imputation conveyed in it has been, more than once, ostentatiously put forward by Mr. Lowe's opponents,—with what justice we shall see presently.

The passage we refer to is the following:—"But when you accused me, would it not have been as well for you to have explained why YOU disregarded your diocesan's counsel, when he advised you to resign the chaplaincy? If contempt has been shown to the power of a Bishop, surely it is by him who refused compliance with an expressed wish, and not by another to whom no such wish was ever communicated." (p. 30.) We could have believed that the clear and *repeated* refusal, on the Bishop's part, to give Mr. Brown *licence* to proceed to Madeira, was even something more than the "communication of a *wish*," on his Lordship's part, that he should not do so; and we are further bound to add, that it does not reach our apprehension how, even if Mr. Lowe *had* "refused compliance with an expressed wish" of his Bishop, it would better Mr. Brown's position. Is B.'s fault extenuated because A. has done wrong also? We hope this is not a specimen of the morality to be inculcated by the Government chaplain at Madeira. However, to return to the subject of the above passage; Mr. Brown wishes to learn *why Mr. Lowe disregarded his diocesan's counsel when he advised him to resign the chaplaincy.* Mr. Brown might have satisfied his curiosity on this matter, we think, without much difficulty. No great mystery has been made of the reasons which induced Mr. Lowe "to disregard his diocesan's counsel;" and it will doubtless be a comfort to Mr. Brown to learn, that the Bishop appears to be perfectly satisfied with them, in spite of the "*contempt*" thus "shown to his *power*." As Mr. Brown professes to be in the dark, we will do what we can to enlighten him on the subject. About a year ago, then, it seems the Bishop wrote to Mr. Lowe, telling him that Lord Palmerston HAVING ADMITTED, in a letter to him (the Bishop of London), *that a foreign chaplain cannot be dismissed without the withdrawal of the Bishop's licence*, it was his Lordship's opinion, that although Mr. Lowe had done nothing to warrant the revocation of his licence, the best course for him to pursue would be, for the sake of peace, to *retire* from the chaplaincy; the principle at stake, *i.e.* that of the independency of the chaplain, by this admission on the part of the

Government, being secured. But, *at the same time, the Bishop thought it right to inform Mr. Lowe that certain charges or complaints had been lately laid against him by a party who had resided for some time in Madeira.* It is usual, as far as our poor experience goes, to give some notice to the accused party when charges of this kind are about to be made, that he may at least have an opportunity of rebutting them, if false. The Rev. Scott F. Surtees (the author of these charges, as it afterwards appeared), it seems, thought otherwise, or, whatever he thought, he *acted* otherwise. Possibly he thought that to stab in the dark is a *safer* course than to encounter one's enemy manfully in open day. The rector of Richmond is not singular in this opinion; although most other men, we believe, would have hesitated to act upon it. It is also a coincidence worthy of remark, that this Rev. Scott F. Surtees should prove to be the bosom friend and rector of the Rev. T. K. Brown; and that he should have so timely exploded this mine under the feet of Mr. Lowe, *at the very period when his friend Mr. Brown was nibbling for the licence*, and putting forth the interest of his great friends, "the Bishop of Ripon, my diocesan, and the Lord-Lieutenant of the North Riding of Yorkshire (*a parishioner of mine*)," to secure the chaplaincy. Doubtless these *coincidences* will occur; but, at least, we must be allowed to consider them *singular* when they do occur. In the present case Mr. Surtees' zeal had been better spared. Mr. Lowe, finding, from the Bishop's letter, that his conduct lay under a serious imputation, of course declined to tender his resignation *until* his ministerial character was cleared. In the mean time seven persons, clergymen and others, addressed the Bishop, severally and distinctly, in indignant contradiction of Mr. Surtees' charges; and also, in the mean time, Lord Palmerston *entirely* RETRACTED (!) *the admission which he had made, and upon which* SOLELY *the Bishop's advice to Mr. Lowe to retire from the chaplaincy had been given.* Need we add, that *since this* the Bishop has NOT advised Mr. Lowe to resign?

Cast off by the Church, Mr. Brown, naturally enough, clings with frantic tenacity to the "law." The Act, 6 Geo. IV. cap. 87, he hugs as closely to his heart as ever did Shylock his darling bond. It is the single thread that keeps the sword suspended over his devoted head. The *law* is his *all;* and, to do him justice, he makes the most of it. The Bishop of London's licence, we are told, is mere waste paper, because no "Act of Parliament" has given him "authority over foreign chaplaincies[5]"

[5] We were not aware, until Mr. B. thus intimated it, that the ancient dioceses of this kingdom were assigned "by Act of Parliament." We had believed that the local distribution of episcopal jurisdiction was determined *in Synod,* (see *Can. Afr.*

(p. 23) : and again, "being perfectly satisfied with the *legality* of his appointment," he professes himself (p. 34) to be "at a loss to discover how it can be a scandal and a reproach." At page 38 we hear of Mr. Lowe's enormities in "openly lifting himself up against *the laws* of England. (!) In page 29 "the *power* of *Parliament* in Church matters" is triumphantly put forth; and, in conjunction with "the late pious and learned Christian, Dr. Arnold," he "feels called upon to protest against the destructive principle of exalting the authority of a Bishop *above* that of the crown and of the *law*." (p. 42.) A loyal sentiment, and a just; but about as much to the purpose, in the present case, as if he had "felt called upon" to protest against exalting the authority of fathers or husbands "above that of the crown and of the law," —an authority which, when it is *not* exercised beyond the limits by God assigned to it, is, *like that authority which is inherent in the episcopate*, independent of crown and law alike; and when it *is* so exercised is fitly to be restrained by the *civil* sword.

After all this it is refreshing to find (p. 42) Mr. Brown giving his sanction to the Divine appointment of Bishops. This reminds us of a passage in the ridiculous letter of three "wiseacres" of Madeira, "Geo. M. Lewis, Chas. R. Blandy, and Henry H. Temple," (can these men be British *Merchants?*) to the Bishop of London, (published by Hatchard in 1846,) in which they are graciously pleased to signify their opinion, "that the practice of *almsgiving* is in itself excellent." It is pleasant to find men who *describe themselves* as "neither ignorant, ill-educated, nor turbulent," thus sanctioning the doctrines of Holy Scripture; and truly they seem to have found in Mr. Brown a pastor qualified in point of *diffidence*, at least, to serve them.

But to return from this digression; we must not straightway think that we have gained more than we actually have by the Reverend Mr. Brown's admission: his assent to the principle of episcopacy is given with that legal caution which distinguishes him, and which, probably, his daily thumbing of "the Act" has infused into him. It is not of Bishops, *as Bishops, i. e.* as an order instituted by God and *essential* to the Church, that he

53. 56. 98; the 6th Can. of Sardica; and the 9th of Archbishop Theodore's Canons, A.D. 673,) or by the Sovereign, by and with the advice and consent of the Synod. We are also very much mistaken if our modern Colonial Bishops have "any authority" given to them over their respective dioceses by "*Act of Parliament.*" We believe that whatever "authority" they possess distinct from that conferred upon them by the Church, is derived from the same source as that of the Bishop of London "over foreign chaplaincies," *i. e.* from the Royal Letters creating their respective dioceses. (See Mr. Lowe's Appendix, p. 80, for an "Historical Proof of the Bishop of London's Foreign Jurisdiction.") Are we then to believe that our Colonial Bishops possess no jurisdiction over their clergy?

approves; no such thing; but as "*learned* and *judicious* men," "advising, guiding, and assisting" (not *ruling*, remark,) "their clergy;" and that be it observed, "*within their dioceses*," a quiet hit at the Bishop of London, whom we doubt not Mr. Brown would fain have to confine his "advice and guidance and assistance" to the clergy of the diocese "*by Act of Parliament*" confided to him. No; it is not on the ground of its divine institution that the sagacious "British Chaplain at Madeira" "gives in his adhesion" to the episcopal order; but because he considers it A *most effective means* (!) of advancing the "true interests of the Church and of our holy religion." When Mr. Brown has grown a little older, and has learnt more of humility and self-distrust than, we grieve to see, he at present possesses; when his crazy boat has been rolled and tossed a little longer in the troubled sea upon which he has adventured himself, he may come to find, what wiser and better men have found before him, that the ways of GOD's appointment are *always*, not *a*, but *the*, most effective means of arriving at the end which the ALMIGHTY has in view; and that in acting as he has done, and is still doing, against one of the most awful of those "means," he has been, and is, "fighting against GOD."

We pass over his silly and disingenuous attempt to pervert the courteous language in which the Bishop of London couched his refusal of the licence into a tacit *approval* of the line of conduct Mr. Brown thought fit, subsequently, in defiance of the Bishop, to adopt. We could have wished that his lordship's conduct had savoured, not less of the Christian gentleman certainly, but, perhaps, more of one who bears the spiritual sword. We humbly conceive, however, with all deference to Mr. Brown, that the duty of "admonishing him of the sin he was about to commit, and warning him of the consequences," lay rather with the Bishop of Ripon, "*his diocesan*," than with the Bishop of London, who was therefore as unlikely to "*claim authority* over him," as he was to "*offer him support*," or "*counsel him to disobey Her Majesty's commands!*" (p. 29.)

We cannot, however, afford so to pass over in silence the remarks which he has thought fit to make on Mr. Lowe's conduct. It is a pity, for his own sake, that he had no friend at hand to counsel him to abstain from such flippant and unbecoming personalities; and to point out to him that the spectacle of a young Yorkshire usher, who, by the successful intrigues of others, has been enabled to step into a post of right belonging to another, and for which in more peaceful times he would probably never have been thought of, sitting in judgment upon the man whom he has thus jostled out of his right,—and that man one of Mr. Lowe's gene-

rally acknowledged high character, attainments, and position in the Church,—and, after a residence of barely *three weeks* on the spot, dealing around him at random such accusations, taunts, and insinuations as the following, is scarcely one to win either the sympathy or approval of his countrymen at home or abroad.

"What a contrast does this determination of yours to retain *at any cost of good feeling* your late appointment," &c.—p. 30.

"Ask yourself whether such BITTER RAILING (*i. e.* in Sect. xiii. of Mr. Lowe's Protest) is in accordance with" &c.—p. 31.

"The seed of schism which has been so widely sown *by your* revival of obsolete customs,"—p. 32.

"That the advice of the Bishop of London urging on you the necessity of caution and moderation, *was not sufficiently followed*—that the recommendation both of the Earl of Aberdeen and Viscount Palmerston to you (either to desist from a course which had brought scandal upon our national Church, and was derogatory to our national character, or to remove from a place *where your ministrations created religious animosities, instead of promoting Christian peace*) was *entirely disregarded,* ARE MATTERS OF PUBLIC NOTORIETY (!)"—p. 34.

"Whatever *blame* rests upon the chaplain rests upon *you.*"—p. 35.

"By *maintaining a* CONVENTICLE of your own, and by *leading away* others from the Church to this CONVENTICLE," &c.—p. 38.

"With this party *you have, by disobeying the powers that be,*" &c. —p. 40.

The good taste and good feeling displayed in this language must, we conceive, be patent to every one. It is a pity when Mr. Brown thought fit to charge Mr. Lowe with *bitter railing* in his Protest, that he did not place in juxtaposition with his charge, the following extract from the *Postscript* to the Protest: "I requested him (Mr. Brown) to regard *any words* or *expressions* in this paper which might *seem strong* or *harsh*, as *forced* from me only by the very urgent circumstances and extreme nature of the case; and I *urgently deprecated* his considering them designed to be *in any way personally discourteous* or *needlessly painful.*" (*!*) The meanness and unfairness embodied in the other taunts and accusations, which we have extracted from the pamphlet, sufficiently betray themselves; the case is too well known to the public at this day, for Mr. Lowe's conduct to need any defence on our part[6]. One thing only remains to be noticed; and as a tit-bit of malevolence we have kept it till the end, although Mr.

[6] The firm support afforded to Mr. Lowe by his Bishop, the memorial addressed to his lordship in his favour, but lately, by seventy-one *communicants* of his congregation, and the *fact* that but *three* out of *fifteen* English clergymen on the island were found to attend the anti-episcopal ministrations of Mr. Brown, may, we think, have at least *equal* weight, with the reader, with the assertions of Mr. Brown.

Brown has thought fit to put it in the head and front of his publication, and in the preface; doubtless hoping that as his pamphlet would be printed, and probably have some circulation in this country, the falsehood of his statement would not be detected here and exposed. The passage in the preface to which we refer is the following: "The history of the Communion plate used in this room" (the *new chapel* in which Mr. Lowe celebrates Divine Service under the Bishop of London's licence) "is as follows: A chalice *was purchased by the congregation*, at the British chapel, in 1844; and afterwards a paten and alms-basin *were added from the money collected at the offertory*. These the late chaplain kept in his own custody; and now *after his supercession by Her Majesty*, and the arrival of his successor, he retains them for the use of the congregation in the ROOM above-mentioned. The reason assigned for this is, that they do not *belong to the Church of England as by law established* (*!*) but to "the Church 'in communion with the Bishop of London.'"

Now in this statement the *first* assertion is NOT TRUE: the Chalice in question was NOT purchased *by the congregation*, but with money raised *by private subscription* amongst a *few members* of the congregation, a list of whose names is extant. The paten and almsdish were *not*, as Mr. Brown fallaciously leads his reader to suppose, "added from" the general fund collected at the offertory, but were purchased with money offered *specifically for that purpose*. However it is better to give the reply to this shameful charge in the words of a printed statement circulated in Funchal, (which Mr. Brown had evidently seen before he put forth his slander, *as he quotes from it*, and he is therefore utterly without excuse,) and which, with many other documents relating to this business, is now before us.

"*Madeira, February* 24, 1848.

"Statements having been made and circulated to the effect that the Reverend R. T. Lowe is not authorized in retaining possession of the chalice, paten, and alms-basin, sometime in use at the late British chapel, in the Rua da Bella Vista, and in employing the same at the administration of the Holy Communion in the congregation of members of the Church of England adhering to the Communion of the Lord Bishop of London, it has been considered due to Mr. Lowe to place the facts of the case before the public.

"In the year 1844, it having appeared to several members of the congregation at the late British chapel that there was no Communion plate properly belonging to the Church of England, (that which was then used being the property of the 'British factory,') a subscription was made for the purpose of providing a chalice. And as the intention of the subscribers was to devote the chalice in question, for ever, to the

sole use of the congregation in communion with the Church of England, it was resolved that it should *not be presented to the trustees of the late British chapel*, as no security could be given that that building would continue in the occupation of such congregation; the Act of Parliament allowing the establishment therein of the Presbyterian form of worship.

"Under these circumstances it was agreed that the chalice in question should be presented at the offertory with the following inscription: DEO ET SANCTÆ ECCLESIÆ ANGLICANÆ, HUNC CALICEM HUMILISSIMI EX FILIIS OFFEREBANT. ANNO AB INCARNATIONE DEI MDCCCXLIV. and be thus placed at the sole disposal of the Reverend R. T. Lowe, to whom, as chaplain, by the 16th Regulation, an irresponsible control is given over all sacramental 'alms and oblations,' and who, it was well known, would take such measures, in any emergency, as he should deem best calculated to secure the object of the donors.

"With the same intention offerings were subsequently made *at the offertory* for a paten and alms-basin, all which Mr. Lowe, from that period to the present, has kept in his own possession.

"Late events have justified the wisdom of this course. Mr. Lowe holding the licence of the Bishop of London, (the ordinary whose virtual jurisdiction over all congregations of English churchmen abroad has been recognized by the Church and State for at least two hundred years,) and the congregation adhering to him being therefore the only congregation in this island in communion with the Church of England, has in the faithful discharge of his trust, according to the intention of the donors, retained the plate in question, in trust for the Lord Bishop of London, for the use of the Church of England in this place, instead of delivering it up to the trustees of what has now become, as publicly declared by the Lord Bishop of Cape Town, at a meeting lately held at the British Consulate, a SCHISMATICAL PLACE OF WORSHIP.

"The Sacramental plate formerly in use, and belonging to the 'factory,' remains, as heretofore, in the hands of the proper trustees."

With this *exposé* we leave the Reverend Thomas Kenworthy Brown. We rise from the perusal of his pamphlet the more confirmed in our conviction of the unrighteousness of his cause, and the more impelled to offer our heartfelt sympathy and support to Mr. Lowe, who has so nobly, and at such great personal sacrifices, maintained the cause of our free and reformed Church. The schismatical leaven working in Mr. Brown is already bringing forth its inevitable results: placed in a position which cannot be maintained by honest argument, he endeavours to prop it up with the most preposterous and untenable *assertions;* knowing that the Church, in the persons of her bishop and clergy, disowns him, he unites with her enemies in undermining her and depreciating the divinely instituted authority of her rulers. Feeling that he is upheld in his present schismatical position only by an arbitrary exercise of the royal power, he not only shows

himself willing to sacrifice the independence of the Church in his efforts to exalt that power beyond the limits assigned to it by God, but shamelessly charges his opponents, who, having a deeper sense of their obligations than he has himself, remember that there is, above all, a God to whom they must answer hereafter, when all earthly kings and Cæsars shall be no more, *with disloyalty* and *faction!* But, to use Mr. Lowe's concluding words, "Let not true churchmen and true loyal hearts be disturbed by such calumnious or 'weak devices.'" Let them take courage rather (1 Pet. iv. 13), remembering that precisely this false accusation was alleged against their Lord Himself. (St. Luke xxiii. 2.) He is the best, and *in the hour of trial* will be found, as ever heretofore, the truest and most loyal subject of the Queen, who is the most faithful and devoted servant of the Church. He will ever be found most ready to "'render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's,'" who is most stedfast in yielding "'unto God the things which are God's[7].'"

[7] Appendix, p. 104.

Art. IV.—*Bishop Jeremy Taylor, his Predecessors, Contemporaries, and Successors. A Biography. By the Rev.* Robert Aris Willmott. London: Parker. 1847.

"I have never believed, and never *will* believe, that any of the writers of the Tracts for the Times will separate themselves from their mother Church." Thus wrote a respected author in 1844[1]; in the candour, trustfulness, and integrity of his heart. And thus, too, thought many others, who were disposed to look hopefully on the great Tractarian movement. All this while, Mr. Newman was hard at work on the "Development of Christian Doctrine:" and is now, as we all sorrowfully know, where that same respected author never thought to see him; having swept away with him a goodly secession of Anglican Presbyters, and grievously shaken the allegiance, we fear, of sundry others, who still painfully linger within the pale of their mother Church's communion. And so, Rome is elate of heart, and full of sonorous jubilation, and prodigal of her orisons for the recovery of England,—once the fairest garden of the pontifical domain, but now, for 300 years, overrun with the weeds of a "pernicious heresy." And, not content with prayers, she is benevolently unsparing of her more outward and visible activities and resources, on our behalf; if so she may win back her misguided children to her embrace.

But this is not all. The chorus of high gratulation and benignant appeal, is varied, from time to time, with notes of stern and contemptuous reproach. For instance, Rome boasts herself to be "fruitful of saints." But where, she exclaims (by the mouth of her champions or her converts), where are the bright examples of sanctity which the revolted communion has to produce? You miserable Anglicans, "who have three centuries of apostasy to atone for—who expects to see you raising saints and martyrs? When is love ever likely to prompt you to deeds of devotion and sacrifice[2]?" The taunt is bitter enough; but, bitter as it may be, and specially as it may be deserved by the men of this money-scraping, jobbing, gambling generation, we must not

[1] See a note to p. 218, of Mr. Gresley's little volume on "Anglo-Catholicism."
[2] See Maurice, Preface to Lectures on the Hebrews, 1846, p. cxix.

allow it to speak to us of despair. We may, indeed, take shame and confusion of face to ourselves; but, we must not surrender our *Church*, and her worthies, to the rebuke and the anathema. Out of the depths of our own personal abasement, it behoves us to look up, and to ask, can this impeachment be altogether just? Can it be true that our reformed communion is entirely without the note of holiness and self-devotion? Can it be true that our "three centuries of *apostasy*" have been three centuries of spiritual barrenness? And, for the answer to this question, let the annals of those centuries be searched; or, if that labour be too much for the patience, or the opportunities, of the toil-worn, mammon-ridden public, let comfort be sought in the lighter fragments and compendiums of Church history and biography. There is no lack of such appliances and aids. They are incessantly issuing forth, in vast abundance and variety. We have an instance now before us. And we do not hesitate to say that, if any man should be troubled in spirit by the "scornful rebuke" of Rome, and by the reproach of sterility, with which Rome evermore assails the Church of England, that man might well take courage from this one little publication—"Bishop Jeremy Taylor, his Predecessors, Contemporaries, and Successors."

A few words more, however, before proceeding to our notice of the volume. In the first place, then, it must, of course, be conceded, that the Latin Church is encompassed by an illustrious *cloud of witnesses*. To question this, would be to fly in the face of history. Neither is the notion to be endured, that all these wonders of saintliness were the product of a slavish, calculating, mercenary principle. Be the dogmatical theology of Rome what it may, we are persuaded that her very greatest men achieved their mighty works, not merely in order that they might thereby purchase heaven, or escape the pains of hell: but, because they were filled with love to God and man; because they loved righteousness and hated iniquity; because they were weary of the tyranny of sin, and impatient for the deliverance of the world from a bondage which they themselves had found to be intolerable; because they were anxious to realize, in their own person, the life and sufferings of the King of Saints himself. In the pulpit, or the confessional, they might perhaps tell their people that all good works were of great price in the sight of God, and would, assuredly, not miss their reward. And they might speak of the doctrine of satisfaction for past transgression; and might expatiate on the righteousness inherent in all those, who, by patient continuance in well doing, were seeking after immortality and honour. And the people might listen to their teaching, till they

came to fancy that they might, indeed, "place God in their account-books;" and, that they might contrive, at the last, to secure a handsome balance in their own favour. But, now, follow these same men into the oratory or the cell: and there we shall have before us a spectacle of what may justly be called their splendid inconsistency. For, can any man believe that the "burning and shining lights" of Mediæval devotion were ever overcast, for an instant, by a shadow of self-righteousness? Is it credible that, when such men were prostrate before God, in penitence or prayer, they could have borne the thought of offering up their own good deeds, in exchange for the joys of heaven? No; if the voice of conscious unworthiness, and deep humiliation, ever went up, with acceptance, to the throne of grace, it must have ascended from the hearts of these great Romanists, and such as these.

But then it must be remembered, that there is one element in the Romish theology, which has a tendency to impart to Romish saintliness something of a peculiar type and expression. A truly heart-stricken Romish penitent feels like one who has lost a treasure, which, if recoverable at all, can be recovered only by the most violent exertions, and the bitterest sacrifices. And hence, principally, the whole Romish apparatus of penitential discipline. And hence, too, it is that the perfect *ideal* of *Romish* saintliness usually appears arrayed in sackcloth, or something equally sordid and tormenting; and often gaunt and ghastly with austerity and maceration. Without these outward indications, there could, it was thought, be no assurance that the spirit of repentance had reached the sinner's inward life.

But there were other influences at work, which powerfully tended to invest the sanctity of Mediæval times, with an exterior of imposing severity and gloom. There is, in the human race, a very strong propensity for hero-worship; and this propensity is always most predominant in ages of ignorance and superstition. The unlettered and untutored million are naturally apt to look, with a mixture of amazement and veneration, on all great victories achieved over those necessities which enslave the larger portion of mankind. And the wonder with which this superiority is regarded, becomes, at length, a decidedly pleasurable emotion. Nay, it is sometimes found to become a passion, and even to grow into a positive want. And thus there arose in the world an incessant craving for the highest spiritual *heroism;* and, with it, something like contempt for all pretensions which fell short of it. The multitudes have generally been most pitiless in their exactions of self-renouncement on the part of those who stood forth as

their chief ghostly counsellors and guides: a truth which was strikingly illustrated in the reign of Hildebrand, when he waged his desperate warfare against the marriage of the clergy. He was vigorously supported, in his anti-matrimonial crusade, by the intolerant *hero-worshippers* of his day; till, at length, a married priest scarcely dared to show his face. He was pretty sure to be hooted and assailed, as a cowardly deserter from the ranks of sacerdotal holiness and dignity. And then, consider what an impulse must have been given to this demand for sainthood, by the contemplation of that vast reservoir of merit, which the lives of holy men kept constantly filled to overflowing; and which the Father of Christendom had to dispense, for the comfort and refreshment of unhappy sinners, who were but scantily endowed with any personal *heroism* of their own! Under the operation of such habits of thought and feeling, it is scarcely wonderful that the highest Mediæval piety should have assumed, for the most part, a sternly ascetic form. The sackcloth, the ashes, the hair-shirt, the iron girdle, the secret flagellation, all these, doubtless, are very marvellous phenomena. But a moderate insight into the mysteries of our nature will suffice to show that they are by no means inexplicable. They are phenomena, which indicate a variety of moving power. In spiritually-minded men, they indicate the agony of the struggle between the spirit and the flesh. In fanatical men, they indicate, often, a fierce intensity of mere self-will. In crafty and ambitious men, they indicate a love of influence and of admiration; a master passion which must be gratified at any sacrifice, however painful and unnatural. And, in some instances, all these impulses may have been strangely and variously combined. But lastly, they indicate that impatient longing for prodigies, which, in all periods, is an attribute of ignorant and vulgar minds; especially when the prodigies are such as to offer some vicarious relief to the pangs of an uneasy conscience.

But the days of ignorance at length began to pass away. First, the invention of the press let in the light upon the chambers of imagery and mystery. The Reformation speedily followed; the last and loudest of a long series of protests against error and corruption. Jerome never was without a representative, ready to brow-beat all resistance against certain expansive elements of evil, which had found their way into the Church. The Reformer of the sixteenth century, however, was armed, not only with an indomitable nature, but with the accumulated momentum of whole centuries of Protestation. And among other results of the mighty movement he achieved, we may reckon this,—that men began

boldly to inquire what was meant by that *crucifixion of the flesh*, which the Gospel speaks of and requires? Did it mean a course of self-inflicted torment, a morose rejection of those good things which God hath given us richly to enjoy, a forcible suppression of the kindliest instincts, and tenderest affections of humanity? And did it mean that, without this incessant and savage war against our nature, all pretensions to eminent sanctity must be scornfully repelled? Or, did it mean an habitual strife for mastery over selfish and unruly passion; an inward conflict, manifested outwardly by a life of beneficence, sobriety, and righteousness, and by a readiness to meet tribulation and death itself, if the exigencies of the Christian warfare should demand it?

How this question has been answered by the Church of England, we all know. We know, too, that her solution of it, to this hour, excites the supercilious contempt of Romanists, and of many among those worshippers of the past, who can see nothing in the present but baseness and degeneracy. It is to no purpose to speak to them of our martyr-bishops: they, we are told, were no better than a set of obstinate rebels, and incorrigible apostates. To mention such names as Jewel, Hooker, Andrews, Hall, Jeremy Taylor, is only to bring down upon our heads a storm of derision. Mere holiday soldiers these! wholly unfit to encounter the hardness of the Church's warfare. Where, we are asked, are the "men of spare figures, and low plaintive voices," gliding about like ministers of peace and mercy, amidst the throng and turmoil of this sin-darkened world? Where is the mortified and solitary man of prayer, the painful wrestler with the Lord, on behalf of the millions who have forgotten Him? The Church of this country (if Church it can be called), we are assured, is absolutely going to decay and ruin for want of saintly and self-renouncing men. She is become a by-word among all who are conversant with the transcendent sanctity of better times! Now, we must confess, (and this, without the slightest inclination to cast dishonour on the bright examples of ancient piety,) that there is a great deal in all this which sounds in our ear much like the utterances of a fantastic sort of pedantry. Numbers of those who speak thus, we suspect, speak quite as much in the spirit of antiquarians, as of Churchmen. They may not, perhaps, be distinctly conscious of this themselves: but, nevertheless, we are pretty well persuaded that, with them, many things are venerable and precious exactly in proportion as they are old and obsolete. And, accordingly, they talk, at times, about as reasonably as certain other pedants have done; those, for instance, who have solemnly deplored the revolution which has been

effected in the art of war; and have complained that there can be no genuine military heroism in these degenerate days: why? because, truly, our warriors go forth no longer "clad in complete steel," nor armed with lance, or with two-handed sword! The monotonous outcry of these dwellers in by-gone time, is often insufferably wearisome. They seem utterly ignorant that religion itself, though immutable in its essence, is susceptible of variety in its outward modes, and visible manifestations: and hence, mere sanctity of life is no saintliness at all, with them, unless it comes provided with the ancient apparatus of self-torture. All things else are undergoing more or less of a superficial change, at least; but no matter! These men would have the precise Mediæval pattern stereotyped. The Anglican Church has thought proper to violate the sacred model; and, therefore, her worthies are not one of them fit for a place in the calendar. The "Devil's Advocate" would be irresistibly armed against their pretensions. We are but little moved by these violent sallies of spiritual Quixotism. We still fearlessly contend that the great worthies of our Church are deserving of all the canonization which they would themselves desire or accept. They, doubtless, would shrink from the thought of being set down in the long catalogue of Rome, which invests her champions with titles, that should, in all decency, be reserved for Apostles and Evangelists; and they would be amply content with an honourable place in the heart of their Church and nation. And, on their behalf, we might confidently say thus to their accusers: Those certainly did ill, who said of the recluse and mortified Baptist, *Behold, he hath a devil!* But, surely, those did worse, who slandered the social facility of our Lord, and exclaimed, *Behold a gluttonous man and a wine-bibber!* And we venture to hope, that wisdom may be justified of her children now, as she was then.

But, the most astonishing faculty of these dreamy idealists and idolaters of the past is, their power of ignoring every thing but the visions which are floating before their own eyes. They are sighing to bring back the golden age of ecclesiastical holiness and discipline; but they utterly forget that it was no pure age of gold, nor any thing at all approaching to it. In vast proportions, it was, likewise, an age of iron, of brass, and of miry clay. It was a long dreary period, illustrated here and there with great virtues, but also black with the most stupendous crimes: and what is worse, popes, and cardinals, and prelates, and monks, were often among the most flagitious of the criminals. But such is the infatuation of the Mediævalists, that they can see no deformity in the object of their admiration. They fix an impassioned gaze

on certain transcendent specimens of excellence and sanctity. To the surrounding and pervading depravity they are inveterately blind; and they fiercely resent all efforts to disperse their blindness. And then they call heaven and earth to witness, that there can be no hope for Christendom, but in a restoration of the *saintly* glories of the Western Church! Till that recovery is accomplished, the beauty of holiness must remain foully mutilated and defaced. Why, that single word of horror and abomination,—the Inquisition,—one would imagine might do something to exorcise the spirit which possesses them; especially when accompanied by the remembrance that, of that accursed institution, many of the *saintliest* heroes of the Latin Church were among the foremost members. Yes, from the men of prayer, and fast, and vigil, and almost unearthly self-renouncement, the cry frequently went forth, which closed the gates of mercy, and let slip the dogs of havoc over provinces and kingdoms. And can this be the class of men whom any one with a heart of flesh in his bosom could wish to recall into life and action, and to reinstate in power, and to set up as the guides and luminaries of the Church? Alas! we fear it is even so! With anguish and dismay we speak it; it is but too clear that persecution itself does not look quite so ugly, as many think, in the eyes of the Romanists, or the Romanizers, of this nineteenth century! We collect as much from certain calm, but ominous and frightful words, of the great leader of the recent movement. Every one who has read the book, must remember—surely, not without a shudder—that passage in the "Development of Christian Doctrine," which concludes thus:—

"St. Clement could not give judgment on the doctrine of Berengarius, nor St. Dionysius refute the Ubiquists, nor St. Irenæus denounce the Protestant view of justification, nor *St. Cyprian draw up a theory of persecution.* There is a time for every purpose under the heaven; a time to keep silence, and a time to speak [3]."

There is no misunderstanding this. A *theory of persecution* is clearly among the legitimate developments of Christian doctrine! The time for it was not come, in the days of Cyprian; but, the time did come at last; and that time has never yet passed away. The theory survives to this hour; although, from the influence of circumstances, the practice may be suspended. We have here a phenomenon of very deep significance; namely, a bright example of Romish sanctity, distinctly recognizing the *theory* of persecution. And can it then be imagined, that a man so honest

[3] Newman: Development, &c. p. 145.

would shrink from the *practice* of persecution? No: if the tribunal of the Inquisition were to be revived to-morrow, of course he would be ready to take his seat there, if required by the Church. It would be positively injurious to his reputation for integrity to suspect that he would hesitate for an instant. And he would find, as his colleagues in that dark consistory, many other saintly men, conscientiously prepared to re-enact, if need were, the horrors of Mediæval Druidism!

But the Inquisition, we may be told, can never be revived. Religious persecution is exploded, and banished from the earth. We might just as reasonably expect the return of Judicial Astrology, or the search for the Philosopher's stone. We should very gladly share in the confidence of those who think so! But we have not so read the history of Christendom. Persecution is a monster, which has, for some considerable period, lain "hushed in grim repose;" torpid, and, to all appearance, powerless. It is, just now, about as harmless as a first rate man-of-war laid up in ordinary. But, it is no sheer hulk, waiting only to be broken up: and nothing could be more perilous than a rash belief that its thunders could never be awakened. If any should laugh at such apprehensions, and tell us that we "feared a painted devil," we would ask them to reflect for a moment upon Rome's terrific statute-book, the Canon Law, which contains, among other things, the whole Institute of Persecution, and of which not a single decree, provision, or enactment, has ever been repealed. We cannot, indeed, pretend to any very profound acquaintance with this Titanian collection; but we believe that the following statement, so far as it goes, will be found to convey some just notion of the greater part of its contents. The Canon Law, then, consists first, of every text of Scripture which is capable of two meanings, one literal, the other mystical, or spiritual; (a mighty convenient apparatus for those who seek to rule the world, whether by terror, or by fraud;) next, of the whole body of Roman Law, which provides, abundantly and mercilessly, for the punishment of all spiritual offences, and which is adopted in gross, and distinctly, as a complement of the ecclesiastical code. It further consists of the decrees of somewhere about five-and-twenty general councils; of certain councils *quasi generales;* and of numerous local councils, in Greece, Africa, Gaul, Spain, Italy, Germany, England, and Ireland. Then we have a vast congeries of *constitutions* of the Roman pontiffs, from St. Peter to the present day; and a mighty contribution from the writings of numberless fathers of the Church, from the earliest times. To these must be added a book, or books, *de Libro Diurno, et*

ordine Romano; at least twenty-five collections of canons; the *Decretum* of Gratian, with various additions by subsequent popes; to say nothing of the works of a host of commentators, whose name is *Legion.* Of this gigantic compilation, the work of Gratian, together with sundry additions to it, forms the authorized compendium; and, so far as we are informed, of this huge mass, not one particle has lost its vitality: the whole is a living oracle, the utterances of which are conclusive at this very day. Behold, then, the vast armoury and magazine of Rome! And recollect, that its implements are not hanging up, "like rusty mail in monumental mockery:" they are bright and keen, and ready for defence, or for aggression, at a moment's notice; and, among them, the "devilish enginry" for the extermination of heretics. Dr. Doyle, and his brethren, may fill whole blue-books with evasive and prevaricating answers to parliamentary interrogatories; but they never can disguise the fact, that, at Rome, nothing ever falls into utter desuetude. *Nullum tempus occurrit Ecclesiæ,* is among her most favourite maxims. Her powers, her claims, her pretensions of every description and magnitude, may go into abeyance, but never can grow obsolete. Her language respecting them is, μέγας ἐν τούτοις Θεὸς, οὐδὲ γηράσκει: and this language her meekest and holiest men are, at all times, prepared to echo back in tempest and thunder. No, no; if we would call back Mediæval saintliness, we must be content to take it even as we find it; with all its fervency of love, and with all its intensity of hate; with its mantle of sanctity, and with the panoply of intolerance bristling beneath it. And this the world would speedily discover, if Rome should ever, for a time, win back her dominion.

But, further: it is quite impossible for any intelligent or thoughtful man to contemplate the saintliness of former centuries, apart from the whole system with which it was identified; or, to which, at least, it was obediently and devotedly subservient. A Romish saint was always, or almost always, one who had surrendered all his faculties to the supremacy of the Romish see; one, who considered the chair of St. Peter as the only centre of life to all Christendom; one, who felt that, separated from that vital centre, he might *have a name to live, but yet would be dead before God.* He was, therefore, one who virtually stood committed to all the absurdity, all the imposture, all the wanton extravagance of distortion and exaggeration, by means of which the Papacy succeeded in oppressing and bewildering the mind of semi-barbarous Europe. And, gracious Heaven! what an exhibition is presented to us, by the growth of the Papal dominion, of the measureless capacities of human credulity, and of the

stupendous audacity of human lust of dominion! The effrontery of the pontifical pretensions would be almost laughable. if we could but banish from our recollection its mighty influences on the destinies of mankind. Its utterances remind us, at times, of the gibberish vented by the masters of thaumaturgy and leger-de-main. A few mystic syllables seem to alter the whole course of nature. A scrap from the Bible, launched from the Lateran or the Vatican, becomes a "thought-executing" element. It does the work of thunder and lightning. We have already adverted to the figurative and mystical applications of Scripture, as among the most sacred and formidable treasures of the Canon Law. And now for a few examples of their mighty virtue. "*Lord, behold, here are two swords;*" (*Ecce duo gladii*). No sooner are the words pronounced, than the temporal and spiritual swords are, at once, within the grasp of God's Vicegerent upon earth. Again; our Lord prayed for Peter that his faith might not fail. What, then, could be clearer than the inference, that the occupier of Peter's chair might contradict himself, without the slightest impeachment of his infallibility? Further; our Lord said to Peter, "*Thou art Peter, and on this rock will I build my Church.*" Who, then, can doubt the elevation of the Bishop of Rome to a transcendent superiority above the rest of the Apostolic college; and, of course, above all future bishops and pastors of the Church of Christ? Once more; the Prophet Jeremiah is solemnly commissioned to proclaim the doom of impious potentates and kingdoms; "*to plant, to build, to root out, and to destroy:*" and, lo! all the thrones on earth are at the mercy of One far greater than the Prophets! Lastly; what the sun is to the moon, even such is the Spiritual Power to the temporal. For, is it not written, that "*the Lord made two great lights; the greater to rule the day, the lesser to rule the night?*" Why, such prodigies of silly and impudent perversion, if attempted, for the first time, in modern days, would be met with one universal shout of derision and scorn. But the lying oracular fragments flew abroad, like wild-fire, in the mediæval darkness; and, strange to tell, they did their work of *glamour*, not only on the ignorant and untutored multitudes, but also on the minds and hearts of the holiest and most learned men, and, thereby, subdued them to the purposes of the enchanter. It was partly, if not wholly, by their influence and potency, that the power which sent them forth continued to expand, from one generation to another, till it reached its plenitude of relentless majesty in the person of Innocent III.; and, at last, in the person of Boniface VIII., went raving mad. And it is utterly impossible to think of that long Reign of Terror, without amazement at the heights of mortal insolence,

and the depths of human degradation. Of a truth, with the exception of events indisputably miraculous, Rome Ecclesiastical is, by far, the most astounding phænomenon in the history of the human race! Rome Republican and Rome Imperial are, each of them, marvellous enough. But they really sink into mere common-place, when compared with the history of Rome, as the citadel both of temporal and of spiritual dominion. And no one, we should imagine, can survey that history, without experiencing a sort of tumultuous confusion of thought respecting the real significance of that same phænomenon. But, of all the wonders which crowd upon us, while engaged in that survey, there is none perhaps more overpowering than this, that the finest intellects, and the purest spirits, should have been dragged at the chariot-wheels of this prodigious system of assumption. The moral of the tale, however, is clear enough; there must have been something unsound and false at the very core of that personal religionism, which could willingly render itself up to so questionable a service. The saintliness of Rome, admirable as it frequently appears, was, as if an Angel of Light were to bow down before an earthly counterfeit of the Invisible and Eternal Majesty. It cannot, therefore, be a safe and fitting object for us to imitate. At all events, we cannot be reasonably called upon to do it the homage of despairing admiration.

To those of our readers who may be familiar with Ecclesiastical History, some apology may be due, for wasting so much of their time and patience on topics so notorious. These pages, however, may chance to meet the eye of some, who are not so habitually conversant with the annals of the Church; and to whom, therefore, a few cautionary sentences may, from time to time, be not altogether useless. And to such persons we would say, that, with all the above considerations before us, we can perceive no rational ground for sympathy with certain thoughtful and learned saint-fanciers, who tragically deplore the poverty and barrenness of our National Church; or, with the tribe of equally fanciful, but not equally learned young gentlemen, who are following in their wake. With unaffected veneration for true sanctity of life, wherever it may be found, we certainly like it none the better for being arrayed in horsehair, or sackcloth, or disfigured with unnatural austerities. We look upon it with suspicion, when we behold it in abject subservience to a Polity which usurps the prerogatives of God, and tramples on the liberties of man. And we view it with positive repugnance and alarm, when we find it ready to launch the curse and the interdict, and to light up the fires of persecution. And, accordingly, notwithstanding the scowl of Romish arrogance and disdain, we

shall continue to regard, with unabated reverence and gratitude, the milder and simpler piety of the worthies of our own Reformed Communion.

We cannot close these remarks, without recalling the attention of our readers to that wonderful portraiture of the genius of Romanism, which Mr. Newman has since retracted. And we protest that we do this, not with the paltry and vulgar object of holding up the author to obloquy and contempt for his inconstancy and defection; but simply because his description conveys what still appears to us a warning infinitely too valuable to be forgotten. Mr. Froude, in his bullying manner, may call it "slang." We call it a masterly and faithful exposition: and this exposition we hold to be most urgently needful at the present time. For, on the one hand, we have the genius of Rome collecting her scattered and almost dormant energies, and once more plying her divinations and enchantments, and dropping poison into the ears and hearts of our wholesome brethren of the English Church. And, on the other hand, we have the men of latitude and liberality, who find in science the only secret of human perfectibility; who laugh at Mediæval frauds or terrors; who tell us that we have no more to fear from the Woman of the Seven Hills, than from Olympian Jove, or Scandinavian Woden; and assure us, by the lips of their incomparable Momus [4], that there are, at the Vatican, only "a wax-work pope, and wax-work cardinals," harmless as the groups of the ingenious Madame Tussaud. We, therefore, produce the testimony of one who, for twenty years past, has been intently studying the history and destiny of the Church of Christ. We appeal back, from Philip drunk, to Philip in his former sobriety. We appeal from the author of the "Development of Christian Doctrine," to the author of "The Prophetic Office of the Church." The utterances of what we hold to have been the period of sobriety, were these:—

"We must take and deal with things as they are, not as they pretend to be. If we are induced to believe the professions of Rome, and make advances to her, as if a sister or a mother Church, (which, in theory, she is,) we shall find too late that we are in the arms of a pitiless and unnatural relative, who will but triumph in the arts which have inveigled us within her reach. No: dismissing the dreams which the romance of early church history and the high doctrines of Catholicism will raise in the inexperienced mind, let us be sure that she is our enemy, and will do us a mischief when she can. In speaking and acting on this conviction, we need not depart from Christian charity towards her. We must deal with her as we would towards a friend who is

[4] The Rev. Sidney Smith.

visited by derangement; in great affliction, with all affectionate and tender thoughts, with tearful regrets, and a broken heart; but, with a steady eye, and a firm hand. For, in truth, she is a Church beside herself; abounding in noble gifts and rightful titles, but unable to use them religiously; crafty, obstinate, wilful, malicious, cruel, unnatural, as madmen are. Or, rather, she may be said to resemble a demoniac; possessed with principles, thoughts, and tendencies not her own; in outward form and in natural powers what God made her, but ruled within by an inexorable spirit, who is sovereign in his management over her, and most subtle and most successful in the use of her gifts. Thus she is her real self only in name; and, till God vouchsafe to restore her, we must treat her as if she were that Evil One which governs her. And in saying this, I must not be supposed to deny that there is any real excellence in Romanism, even as it is; or that any really excellent men are its adherents. Satan ever acts on a system, various, manifold, and intricate; with parts and instruments of different qualities; some almost purely evil, others so unexceptionable, that in themselves, and detached from the end to which all is subservient, they are really 'angels of light,' and may be found so at the last day. In Romanism there are some things absolutely good, some things corrupted, and some things in themselves sinful. But the system itself, so called, must be viewed as a whole, and all parts of it as belonging to the whole, and in connexion with their practical working and the end which they subserve."—*Proph. Off.* pp. 103, 104.

So much for Rome's monopoly of saintliness. And now for Jeremy Taylor. One is glad of any thing which recalls him to our thoughts. The very mention of his name is a refreshment to the spirit, wearied with the whims, and the caprices, and the extravagancies of what may be called the *archæological* school of saintliness. We have, in him, a saint of the seventeenth century, whom we would not exchange for any name in the Romish calendar, always excepting the names of Apostles, and of apostolic men. We have before us one who, to borrow the language of his present biographer,—

"taught men that the Gospel has no alliance with tyranny; that it searches consciences without an inquisition, and supplies martyrs without a wheel; that bigotry is not essential to faith, nor the perdition of our neighbour to the salvation of ourselves. Convinced that no party possessed a monopoly of truth, he weighed the reasons of men, rather than their names. . . . . His sojourn among men was a journey to angels. Heaven was around him, not only when he entered the world, but when he left it. Always, and every where,—as student, priest, and Bishop,—persecuted or triumphant, joyful or weary, he beheld lights and faces which dwell not in the common day, but shine down upon the traveller who, in the wilderness, feels that he is in God's work and in God's house."—(pp. 290, 291.)

The present biography and criticism, the author tells us, is "an

attempt to bring the subject of it nearer to the eye and hand." The Life of Jeremy Taylor, it is true, had already been executed by the masterly and sainted hand of Heber. But the work of Heber, he goes on to inform us, is wholly inaccessible to a very large class of readers, and "may be said to be within sight rather than within reach;" seeing that it is prefixed to the fourteen volumes of Bishop Taylor's writings, and is not to be procured in a detached form. Now, who would not conclude from this statement that no separate edition of the Life by Heber had ever been given to the public? And what will be the surprise of the less-informed portion of the public, when they learn that two separate editions of the Life have actually been printed; one in two small volumes, and another in one volume octavo? For any thing we know, indeed, both these editions may now be out of print; and if so, they may, for the time, be, intelligibly enough, described as inaccessible. But, even if this should be the case, it would afford no excuse to Mr. Willmott for committing himself to a broad assertion, which obviously suggests the inference that none could have seen the Life of Bishop Taylor, but those who may have had access to the complete edition of his works.

But, be this as it may, the present volume may not be altogether without its use. In the first place, it is written with considerable vivacity; though, perhaps, with something too much of ambition and pretension. Secondly, it is of very moderate dimensions; "all elaborate analysis of 'treatises and doctrines' having been avoided." And, in our judgment, the author has done wisely in thus limiting his design, and eschewing all diffuseness. After the labours of Heber and others, an additional and lengthy discussion of Taylor's character and merits would have been wholly superfluous, and almost impertinent; nearly as much so as a new and copious essay on the writings and genius of Shakspeare himself. Besides, a bulky disquisition might have deterred that very fastidious and impatient personage, the general reader. Even the separate octavo volume of Heber might, possibly, be too much for those who sometimes read only "for want of other idleness;" whereas the patience even of the divinities of the drawing-room will scarcely be exhausted by a little book of three hundred small pages, comprising not only the Life of Taylor himself, but also brief notices of his predecessors, contemporaries, and successors. The work, therefore, may very well be allowed to appear on the great central round table of many a brilliant saloon; and there, perhaps, may become the means of awakening, among the high-born and the elegant, a passionate desire to become more familiar with the most imaginative of divines, and the most heavenly-minded of Christian prelates. It might, to say the least, be quite as worthy to be so placed as certain little volumes, garnished with

black letter, and red lines, and margins fantastically patterned or illuminated, which we so frequently see glittering on embroidered ottomans and sofas.

The author claims some merit "for originality." But the originality seems to be exemplified chiefly in this, that "the reader who is familiar with Heber's history of Taylor will find some circumstances untold before, and see facts, already communicated, placed in a new light." The additions and corrections, however, appear to be of no very weighty importance. Of these, perhaps the most interesting will be found in the following passage:—

"The parliamentary resolution, in the October of the same year (1642), to sequester the livings of the loyal clergy, was soon felt at Uppingham. Upon this interesting portion of Taylor's history the researches of Heber were unable to throw any light; nor could the friendly inquiries of the Bishop of Peterborough ascertain the date of his deprivation, or the name of his intrusive successor. One of these difficulties may now be removed, upon the evidence of a contemporary writer, from which it will be seen that the reputation and piety of Taylor failed to preserve his house from plunder, or his family from insult and ill-treatment. The following remarkable passage from the 'Mercurius Aulicus,' for the week ending May 2, 1644, is now reprinted for the first time after an oblivion of two hundred years[5]. The writer, illustrating the character of the puritan preachers, thus continues his history of the week:—

"'Monday, May 6.—Now, if you would see what heavenly men these lecturers are, be pleased to take notice, that at Uppingham, in Rutlandshire, the members have placed one Isaac Massey to teach the people, (for the true pastor, Dr. Jeremy Taylor, for his learning and loyalty is driven thence, his house plundered, his estate seized, and his family driven out of doors). This Massey, at a communion this last Easter, having consecrated the bread after his manner, laid one hand upon the chalice, and smiting his breast with the other, said to the parishioners, "*As I am a faithful sinner, Neighbours, this is my morning draught;*" and turning himself round to them, said, "*Neighbours, here's to ye all!*" and so drank off the whole cupfull, which is none of the least. Many of the parish were hereby scandalized, and therefore departed without receiving the sacrament. Among which, one old man, seeing Massey drink after this manner, said aloud, "Sir, *much good do it you.*" Whereupon, Massey replied, "Thou blessest with thy tongue, and cursest with thy heart; but 'tis no matter, for God will bless whom thou cursest." This Massey, coming lately into a house of the town, used these words, "*This town of Uppingham loves Popery, and we would reform it, but they will not;*" and without any further coherence,

[5] I am indebted for the discovery of this passage to a notice in Mr. Churton's Minor Prose Works of Bishop Pearson, i. 25. Oxford, 1844.

said, "*But I say, whosoever says there is any king in England besides the Parliament at Westminster, I'll make him for ever speaking more.*'" The master of the house replied, "*I say there is a king in England besides the Parliament in Westminster.*" Whereupon Massey, with his cudgel, broke the gentleman's head. Whoever doubts that Mr. Massey is injured by these relations, may satisfy themselves by inquiring of the inhabitants of Uppingham parish.'

"This narration is very painful to read; but our disgust should not induce us to question its truth. The 'Mercurius Aulicus' was a newspaper issued by the royalist party, and frequently written by Sir John Birkenhead. The present number may have proceeded from his pen. In that case, he probably derived his information from Taylor himself, who knew Birkenhead, often meeting him at Oxford, and other places. One allusion to him occurs in a letter to Evelyn, in reference to the sneer of some Romanists, that the Church of England had lost her head in the martyrdom of Charles. 'I remember that when the Jesuits, deriding our calamity, showed this sarcasm to my Lord Lucas, Birkenhead, being present, replied as tartly, "It is true our Church wants a head now; but if you have charity, as you pretend, you can lend us one, for your Church has had two or three heads at a time."'"—pp. 104—106.

From the above account it would appear that Bishop Rust, who preached the funeral sermon on Taylor, must have been "incorrect in saying that the storm descended on him as soon as he launched into the world;" for, Taylor was presented to the rectory of Uppingham, in Rutlandshire, early in the spring of 1637 (March 23): and his expulsion can hardly have taken place before the parliamentary edict of 1642; and, if so, he must have remained unmolested, in his parochial retirement, during a happy interval of five years. For the next eighteen years, his life was one of almost perpetual unsettlement and suffering; so that, as the author remarks, "it is one of the painful difficulties of Taylor's biographer, that he is often unable to trace his path, except by his calamities." (p. 173.) And yet we find him always bearing up against the onset of adversity with a cheerful and contented spirit; thankfully rejoicing "in that mercy which daily makes decrees in heaven for his comfort and support."

The history of Taylor during the civil wars is but obscure and indistinct. Wood tells us that he followed his royal master in the capacity of chaplain. And this assertion, the author thinks, is confirmed by the internal testimony of his works.

"I am not aware," he says, "that any of his biographers or critics have pointed out the vividness and number of his martial images. Keble proves the military experience of Homer from the allusions to arms and combats; and the reader of Taylor's sermons often finds himself hurried into the tumult of the camp, or the terrors of the conflict,

by the same freshness and truth of description. A striking example occurs in his discourse entitled 'Apples of Sodom[6]', where he represents the sinner overcome by the violence of a strong temptation, and awaking, when the fever subsides, to the full horror and peril of his condition: 'But so have I known a bold trooper fight in the confusion of a battle, and, being warm with heat and rage, receive from the sword of his enemy wounds open like a grave; but he felt them not: and when, by the streams of blood, he found himself marked for pain, he refused to consider then what he was to feel to-morrow; but when his rage hath cooled into the temper of a man, and clammy moisture hath checked the fiery emission of spirits, he wonders at his own boldness, and blames his fate, and needs a mighty patience to bear his great calamity.' The wounded trooper carries us back to Naseby or Marston-Moor. The following sketch of a humbler hero bears indications of having been painted from life:—

"'And what can we complain of the weakness of our strengths, or the pressures of diseases, when we see a poor soldier stand in a breach, almost starved with cold and hunger, and his cold apt to be relieved only by the heats of anger, a fever, or a fired musket, and his hunger slacked by a greater pain or a huge fear? This man shall stand in his arms and wounds, pale and faint, weary and watchful; and at night shall have a bullet pulled out of his flesh, and shivers from his bones, and endure his mouth to be sewed up from a violent rent to its own dimensions[7].'

"In another place, the man who prays with a discomposed spirit is compared to him 'that sets up his closet in the out-quarters of an army, and chooses a frontier garrison to be wise in.' Where no particular allusion to military affairs is detected, the language shows the writer's familiarity with the field and the camp. In the case of a believer who has intermitted the watchfulness of prayer, 'the temptation returns and forages, and prevails and seizes upon our unguarded strengths.'"—pp. 109—111.

These passages (and similar ones might probably be found) certainly appear to indicate much personal familiarity with "scenes of broil and battle;" and to show that Taylor had many opportunities of seeing the warfare of faith sternly illustrated by instances of bitter suffering and heroic endurance, in the warfare of loyalty. The warfare of faith he had himself still to sustain, in sharp poverty and heavy tribulation, when the warfare of loyalty was over; and it is abundantly notorious that he, and numbers of his persecuted brethren, acquitted themselves like dauntless and faithful soldiers of the cross. The Restoration put an end to his trials as a public man, and promoted him to an Irish bishopric: why not to an English one, it may be difficult to say; for who had more righteously merited the most eligible preferments and

[6] Works, v. 293. [7] Holy Dying, ch. iii. § 4.

honours of the Church? Our author conjectures that it was his second marriage which banished him from England. The lady, it is said, was a natural daughter of Charles I. And Charles II. may, perhaps, have been desirous to remove, as far as possible out of sight and recollection, the memorial of his royal father's lighter moments. Not that the adventure was one which was likely to have much impaired his own filial veneration for the name and memory of his honoured sire; only the affair might look rather awkward in the eyes of a grinning, meddling, and censorious world.

But though the storm of adversity was overpast, the Bishop was followed by an unhappy destiny into his domestic retirements. Of his surviving children, one son is said to have fallen in a duel with a brother officer of his regiment; the other died of consumption at the seat of the profligate and worthless Duke of Buckingham, of whom he was the favourite companion and secretary; too probably the victim of that licentiousness which has made the reign of Charles II. perhaps the most infamous in the annals of England. It is unspeakably painful to contemplate the deadly shadows which thus extinguished the lineage of so holy and so illustrious a man. But the dispensations of God's providence are inscrutable. From the days of Eli and his sons to the present hour, many an instance, we fear, might be found of precipitate degeneracy from paternal sanctity and virtue. We are not, however, to suppose that Taylor erred after the similitude of Eli. There is no reason to imagine him guilty of culpable flexibility in the training of his children. On the contrary, as our author observes, his system of education seems to have embodied the Grecian hardihood of Milton.

"Fathers," he says, in his 'Holy Dying,' "because they design to have their children wise and valiant, apt for counsel or for arms, send them to severe governments, and tie them to study and hard labour and afflictive contingencies. They rejoice when the bold boy strikes the lion with his hunting spear, and shrinks not when the beast comes to affright his early courage. The man that designs his son for noble employments, to honours and to triumphs, to consular dignities and presidencies of councils, loves to see him pale with study, or panting with labour, and eminent by dangers."—p. 215.

Whether Bishop Taylor may have been tempted to drive his rigorous principles of discipline to an unwise extremity, and so to produce a vicious reaction, which carried his unhappy sons in the opposite direction, it would be idle to conjecture. It may have been so; but it is difficult to imagine it. The very surmise seems to do injustice to the inborn humanity and gentleness of his

nature. Such things, however, have not unfrequently happened, and are still constantly occurring. Fathers are often found to forget the apostolic precept, *Provoke not your children to wrath* and irritation, *lest they be discouraged.* It requires no ordinary measure of wisdom and of grace to attain the due temper between facility and rigour.

Whether the days of Taylor were shortened by the pressure of these heavy visitations cannot now be known; but be this as it may, the evil courses of his sons must have brought him to the grave in sorrow. And that grave, unhappily, was an early one.

"At Lisburn, on the 13th of August, 1667, in the fifty-fifth year of his age, and the seventh of his episcopate, expired the more than Chrysostom of England. . . . . He passed through the dark gate into the garden, when the eye of fancy had not grown dim, nor the arm of intellect become feeble. Having borne the heat and burden of the day, he received his wages before the sun was set and the dews of the night began to descend. Called home in the rich autumn of his life, he was busy in the field and the harvest. The sheaves were piled round him when he fell asleep,

'And from his slack hand dropped the gathered rose.'"—*Willmott*, p. 212.

Mr. Willmott has enriched his pages with numerous extracts from the works of Taylor, illustrative of the very peculiar character of his mind. The task of selection must have been a very delightful one, though somewhat perplexing from the vast extent and variety of opulence spread out before him. We have "Beauties of Shakspeare," and "Beauties" of many other writers both in prose and verse; but we know of scarcely any other writer who could furnish forth a more enchanting "Book of Beauty" than Bishop Taylor. He has often been called the Shakspeare of Theology; and we would gladly see the choicest specimens of excellence selected from the poet and the divine, and bound up together. In one respect the divine would have the advantage, seeing that the whole of his costly treasures,—his gold, his frankincense, and his myrrh,—all were consecrated to the honour of his Redeemer and his God.

We can scarcely listen with common patience to the complaint of Coleridge, and of others not worthy to hold a light to Coleridge; namely, that Taylor's exhibition of the work of redemption, and of the Divine Author and Finisher of the Faith, is but occasional and imperfect. As Mr. Willmott truly observes, "If there be one feature in his sermons more remarkable than another, it is the chaste and loving reverence with which he delineates the character and attributes of Jesus Christ upon earth in his relation to the human family." A mind scholastically trained may, per-

haps, desiderate more of dogmatic hardness and precision than he will often find in Taylor's doctrinal statements; but a gentle and docile spirit, while conversant with him, must feel itself to be living and moving in the very midst of the work of redemption, breathing the very air of divine love, and expatiating, as it were, in the cloudless serenity of heaven. That the austere and withering genius of Calvinism should look angrily upon him is, indeed, very far from surprising; for, although no Christian teacher has ever presented more overpowering exhibitions of the *terrors of the Lord*, yet it is quite evident that he never can be numbered among the *doctores immisericordes* of the Calvinistic school. The Divine benignity and compassion were far more favourite themes with him. As a clear indication of the natural tendency of his thoughts and hopes, we shall add to Mr. Willmott's collection, by transcribing the following passage from his second sermon, on "The Miracles of Divine Mercy:"—

"There are many secret and undiscerned mercies by which men live; and of which men can give no account, till they come to give God thanks at their publication: and of this sort is that mercy which God reserves for the souls of many millions of men and women, concerning whom we have no hope, if we account concerning them, according to the usual proportions of revelation, and the Christian commandments; yet, we are taught to hope some strange good things concerning them, by the analogy and general rule of the Divine mercy: for, what shall become of ignorant Christians; of people that live in wildernesses; people that are baptized, and taught to go to church, it may be, once a year; people that can get no more knowledge; they know not where to have it, nor how to desire it: and yet, that an eternity of pains shall be consequent to such ignorance, is unlike the mercy of God! and yet, that they should be in any disposition towards an eternity of intellectual joys, is nowhere set down in the leaves of revelation: and, when the Jews grew rebellious, or a silly woman of the daughters of Abraham was tempted, and sinned, and was punished with death, we usually talk as if that death passed on to a worse: but yet, we may arrest our thoughts on the Divine mercies; and consider that it is reasonable to expect from the Divine goodness, that no greater forfeiture be taken upon a law, than was expressed in its sanction and publication.

"The effect of this consideration we would have to be this: that we may publicly worship this mercy of God, which is kept secret; and, that we be not too forward to sentence all heathens and prevaricating Jews to the eternal pains of hell, but to hope that they have a portion in the secrets of the Divine mercy; where, also, unless many of us have some little portions deposited, our condition will be very uncertain, and sometimes most miserable. . . . . But, as in these things we must not pry into the secrets of the Divine economy, (being sure that, whether it be so or not, it is most just even as it is;) so we

may expect to see the glories of the Divine mercy manifested, in unexpected instances, in the great day of manifestation."—(*Mir. of Divine Mercy*, Serm. ii., *ad finem.*)

At all this, a rigid Calvinist would, perhaps, be ready to rend his garments, and to stop his ears. He would tell us that all, without exception, come into the world meriting damnation; that God designs to ransom only a few from the general doom; that they who are without sufficient means and opportunities of knowing the truth, cannot be of that elect number, and must therefore perish everlastingly; but, that still they have no reason to complain; seeing that, after all, they meet with no more than their deserts! Of course, we are not going to plunge into the bottomless pit of the dispute. We shall just content ourselves with professing that, on this matter at least, we should rather be disposed to err with Taylor, than to be right with Calvin; if right he can possibly be!

We subjoin the following specimen of Mr. Willmott's criticism and composition:—

"Without lingering to subject these discourses to any further analysis, I may notice the sublime description of the world, suddenly transformed into a kingdom of fear, pervaded by a dreadful twilight, and echoing with the simultaneous shriek from an infinity of graves, bursting open at the summons of the trumpet, which is heard rolling over the dissolution and crash of all this wonderful fabric of external nature. Every where we see a tremendous power of aggravation, and a breadth and vehemence of execution, that belong to the noblest scenes of tragedy. One image has always struck me by its immeasurable capacity of terror; it is the comparison of the sufferings of the doomed sinner, converging into a dark and indivisible unity of torment—not broken or weakened by the participation of millions of lost souls—to the whole body of the sun, which is seen by every one in the same horizon. The Contemplations of the State of Man contain a simile of equal power, where the Divine justice is likened to a river of fire, obstructed and dammed up during thirty or forty years, but rushing upon the sinner at the last day, with an irresistible inundation, and flooding him, at the same moment, with flame and vengeance.

"Other sermons display the abundance or the brightness, the wisdom or the tenderness of his learning and intellect, his experience and sympathy: that on the Marriage Ring is more beautiful; that on the House of Feasting more varied; that on the Good and Evil Tongue more ingenious; that on the Faith and Patience of the Saints more pathetic; but the discourses on the Second Advent of Christ unfold the action of his mind in its grandest operations of creative energy[8]. They are the best examples of the sublimity which formed a chief element of

[8] Mr. Alexander Knox (*Remains*, i. 271) mentions the third volume of Taylor's Sermons, as equal to any composition in the English language.

his genius; that mysterious faculty of representation and impression, which makes dead thoughts to live and move; peoples the Purgatory of Dante, and animates the portraitures of Tacitus; too subtle to be enclosed in a definition, and evaporating from the crucible of the critic; a flame often invisible, but never extinguished; sinking in one age, to ascend in another; here, flashing upon the chisel of Phidias; there, driving on the pen of Sallust; now making the sails of the Argonautic ship to quiver beneath the wings of the eagle, in the verse of Apollonius [9]; and now darkening the creation with the solitary hand of God, in the epic of Milton [1]. Descriptions such as these resemble certain pictures, and are not to be looked close into, like the Candle-light of Shelken, or the interiors of Mieris. You must stand back to contemplate the figures and scenery of Shakspere or Taylor, and supply the atmospheric calculation of the painter by the softening distance, which a cultivated taste interposes as the medium of vision.

"In some of his speculations upon the invisible world, and its retributive sufferings, he indulged in a daring extravagance, that combines the monstrous associations of Bosch with the hideous realities of Morales; but in the discourses on the Advent, his juster parallel is supplied by the most famous work of M. Angelo. Perhaps the sermons and the picture fail in sufficiently awakening our sympathy. We wonder and tremble; but the heart is not proportionably affected. The vigour of conception, the austerity, the confusion, the turbulence of thought, and, what Foster well called, the assailant impetuosity of the argument, unite in bending the proudest spirit. But the exhortation is sometimes too learned to be natural; and the preacher is lost in the scholar, as the painter was in the anatomist."

The criticism in the concluding paragraph, we hold to be eminently just. Old Samuel Johnson never spoke a truer word than when he said, that the thought of final retribution carries every man far beyond the domain of poetry (further still, we may add, beyond the domain of rhetoric),

"By spreading over his mind a general obscurity of sacred horror, that oppresses distinction, and disdains expression."—*Life of Young.*

"Our Lord's discourses," says Paley, "exhibit no particular description of the invisible world. The future happiness of the good, and the misery of the bad (which is all we want to be assured of), is directly and positively affirmed; and is represented by metaphors and comparisons

[9] B. ii. v. 1251.

[1] The archangel reproaches Satan for presuming to war with God, who,

> "Out of smallest things could without end
> Have raised incessant armies to defeat
> Thy folly, or *with solitary hand*
> Reaching beyond all limit, at one blow,
> Unaided could have finish'd thee, and whelm'd
> Thy legions under darkness."

Of these lines, Mr. Haydon truly observes, that they embody one of the most awful conceptions upon earth.

which were plainly intended as metaphors and comparisons, and as nothing more. As to the rest, a solemn reserve is maintained."—*Evidences*, vol. ii. c. 2.

And the inspired ministers of our Lord, of course, never presumed to violate that mysterious concealment. But, in after-ages, superstition rushed in, where apostles feared to tread. And hence, the "fiery floods"—the "thrilling regions of thick-ribbed ice"—the "imprisonment in viewless winds"—and all the other monstrous creations of "unlicensed thought," which peopled the purgatory and the hell of Mediæval Christianity. Hence the frightful pictures of the *Inferno;* the images at once hideous and disgusting, and often abominably grotesque; the scenes which curdle the blood, and make the flesh creep; but which never yet bowed down any soul of man in reverential prostration before the majesty of Divine justice. The painters were as bad as the poets. Who at the present day can look, without positive loathing, on their representations of the day of judgment? Who is there that does not feel religion to be shamefully degraded by exhibitions of the sulphurous furnace, and the imps of vengeance, armed with torch or pitchfork, and arrayed in all the vulgarest attributes that ever were conceived in barbarous days, by daring and almost delirious imaginations? The mere artistic execution may, as such, often command the warmest admiration; but the picture produces no more moral effect than the closing scene of the opera of Don Juan. We may be enchanted by the forms and colours of Michael Angelo, or by the wondrous harmonies of Mozart. But who was ever made a better Christian by these miracles of their genius? It so happened, however, that Taylor lived when the pure blaze of truth had not wholly chased away the *Dantesque* visions which haunted the owl-light of darker times. If he had flourished a little later, his taste would, probably, have been more chastised, and his fancy under steadier control.

We have no space left for the Predecessors, Contemporaries, and Successors, of Jeremy Taylor. We must content ourselves with the central figure of the group, as presented to us by one, who, to use his own words,

"May plead a long and affectionate intimacy with the illustrious Bishop himself, in the relation of disciple and master, as an apology for confidence. Accustomed, from early youth, to sit at his feet, he has watched (if the figure may be allowed), each varying expression of that countenance of beauty and peace, which looks out from every solemn and learned page. He, whose eye constantly turns to one portrait, however rude his knowledge of art, may sometimes give a truer account of it, than the most accomplished spectator, with all the galleries of Europe in his remembrance."—*Preface*, pp. x. xi.

Art. V.—*On the English Policy in Greece.*

[The following paper having been sent to us, we have pleasure in directing attention to the important statements and views bearing on the present state of Greece, which are comprised in it.—Ed.]

Greece is but a small country, possessing barely a million of inhabitants, a revenue of five hundred thousand pounds sterling, and an army of five thousand men. Yet, such as it is, it attracts considerable attention, and has always had the privilege of exciting general interest. It is the country of our early studies, the theatre of ancient prowess, the birth-place of Homer and Socrates; and its recent resurrection was hailed with enthusiasm by all the nations of Europe, and in England more than elsewhere. The Greeks still preserve a grateful remembrance of Byron, whose inspired songs sustained them at the outset of their struggle; and of Hastings, who nobly shed his blood in their cause.

But it is not only her past glory or her recent exploits that entitle Greece to most serious attention; she possesses certain advantages which, in spite of her present feebleness, give her some weight in the political balance in Europe. She may be considered as the head of a great body, whose members are dissevered. The language which she has inherited from Plato is spoken by several millions of men, spread over all the coast and a great part of the interior of Asia Minor. The identity of her origin and of her religion, and the superiority of her civilization and of her political institutions, give her an incontestable influence over all the Grecian populations which are politically detached from her, and that influence may also become of great importance with regard to the other Oriental races. The Greeks, though still a European people, are still more than half Asiatic; their character, as well as their origin, partakes of the two quarters of the world, on the confines of which they are situated; their ideas are drawn from the schools of the West, while their habits are those of their eastern climate. If it is important to Europe to extend to Asia the benefits of her civilization and the truth of her doctrines, no people is better placed to effect the transmission, and to render the East accessible to the progress of the West. But Greece seems to have been, above all, destined, by her position, for commercial prosperity. Situated in the

centre of the Mediterranean, as near Asia as Africa, on the high road to India, as well as on that to the Black Sea, she is the natural mart of all exchange between the three parts of the ancient continent. Her territory, intersected in every direction by arms of the sea, which advance into the interior in deep gulfs, is surrounded by a continuous belt of the finest harbours in the Mediterranean, and which are in every direction explored by trade. Her inhabitants, cradled by the waves from their very infancy, form a whole people of intrepid and experienced mariners, and have already set afloat some fifteen thousand ships, of which the smaller perform the coasting service of the Egean, and the larger trade to the Black Sea. A country possessing advantages of this nature may, in a short time, and under propitious circumstances, acquire sufficient importance to render the influence which Great Britain exercises there a question of no slight interest.

But we have also to indicate considerations of a higher order, and which seem to us to recommend more particularly to public attention the country of which we speak. It was St. Paul himself who, from the top of Mars' Hill, announced the truths of the Gospel to the Greeks; it was in their language that these truths were principally written, and that the Apostles added to them their inspired commentary. Scarcely had the religion of Christ risen from the state of an obscure and persecuted sect, than it was installed by Constantine upon a Grecian throne, whose empire extended over the whole world, and whose magnificence clothed it with a splendour of external rites sanctioned by the early Fathers.

The Greeks still maintain, with all the rigour of a nation who, during long years of captivity, had no other bond of nationality, no other hope of deliverance than their religion, the observance of those forms and ceremonies instituted at Byzantium in the ancient days of the Church, by the venerable Fathers who first established Church discipline, on the foundation laid by the Apostles. A more studied acquaintance with the Eastern Church, and a more continued connexion with her, might exercise a happy influence, not only on herself, but on the Church of England. To those who search for forms in order to give the necessary stability to ideas, the Greek Church can furnish many more respectable by their antiquity, and more pure in their origin, than the Roman; and it might be possible to arrive through her at many a primitive institution without passing through the corruption of Rome. While, on the other hand, the intellectual character of the Church of England might contribute powerfully to raise that of Greece to the height of purity from which every religion sub-

jected to material forms runs risk of falling away; and to accustom the people to elevate their minds to the spirit of their religion, by dissipating the darkness of ignorance and superstition into which long ages of thraldom have plunged them. In fine, English influence in Greece might effect the completion of their moral regeneration, as the Greeks, whatever may have been said of them by those who find it easier to judge a nation by the prejudices of others than to examine for themselves, are by nature a people gifted with a fund of common sense and sound judgment rarely to be found; and as to their honesty, the quality which is the most resolutely denied them, it is a notorious fact that before the Revolution at Hydra, which was the centre of the maritime and commercial activity of the Greeks, bonds were unknown, and capitalists confided to the captains of merchant ships large sums on their word alone, which sums, with their portion of the gains, were always faithfully restored. Speaking then of the people, not of the political men who in most countries form a class apart on this head, we maintain that the Greeks only require a good religious education, good precepts, and good examples, to become worthy of their ancestors.

But it is important, above all, to examine whether the influence of another foreign power is not so well established and so absolute in Greece, as to render that of Great Britain an impossible vision. Some politicians think so; and seeing that English influence has not yet taken firm root in the country, draw from thence the conclusion, that it can only be established and maintained by force. We think that they deceive themselves as completely, and compromise the English interests in the East as imprudently, as those who, starting from a diametrically opposite principle, arrive at the same result; believing that English influence can and ought to reign exclusively in Greece, and who regulate their conduct according to that conviction. Facts will prove our assertion. The most generally received idea is, that the near neighbourhood of Greece to Russia, the identity of religious doctrines, the plan long since determined on and most skilfully carried out by the Muscovite government, and the hopes of further deliverance entertained by them among the Greeks, must irremissibly fix them in the wake of Russia.

But that the identity of religion establishes an indisputable link, is true only under certain conditions. History does not authorize us to admit this axiom as a general theory, and the exigences of politics have occasioned wars between those of the same religion not less frequently than alliances. It certainly cannot be denied that the Greeks while groaning under the tyranny of a barbarous people, the enemies of their religion, and burning

with the desire to break their chains, though not feeling themselves strong enough without foreign assistance, turned their eyes to their-fellow Christians, whose faith was outraged in their own, and founded more particularly their hopes on those who had a more immediate interest in avenging their dogmas, and who fomented these hopes by brilliant promises. The cause of the Greeks under the Turks was as much that of religion as of liberty; it was, therefore, natural that religious affinity should be of great importance to them; and the Russians, who have since the days of Catherine the Great had their eyes fixed upon Constantinople, spared no pains to keep up this disposition among the Greek populations. Their young men were invited to the schools of Russia, the highest posts in the army and in the administration were open to them, and on every occasion where a stroke of Mussulman tyranny could be averted, Russia alone interposed between the victim and the oppressors, while the other powers abandoned to her the part of benefactress, which the Greeks gradually became accustomed to recognize in her. Besides this, Russian emissaries continually traversed the country, keeping up by their promises the hope of liberty smouldering in the heart of people; and among other means employed to this end, one of the most curious were the prophecies published towards the close of the last century under the title of Agathangelos, and which circulate to this day throughout Greece, where they pass for inspired, and of the remotest antiquity. In the midst of much mystical phraseology, it is said that the Greeks shall be delivered by the *fair-haired nation;* but what is an extraordinary co-incidence, it is also said that a *Bavarian* shall reign over Greece! These means, of course, acted powerfully on the minds of an enslaved people; and every time the Russians wished to cause embarrassment to the Turkish government, the Greeks responded to their call, and rose in arms: but as soon as the end in view was obtained, they were abandoned, without defence, to the vengeance of their angry masters, and paid with their blood their passing dream of independence. This policy, several times repeated, however, soon produced distrust; and when Riga once more attempted the deliverance of his country, it was on France, not on Russia, that he founded his hopes; and some time later the Bey of Maina, old Mavromichali, who died only a few months ago, personally solicited Napoleon in favour of Greece. The independence of Greece changed still more her position with regard to Russia: in freeing herself from the yoke of the Turks she emancipated herself from the patronage of Russia, whose protection was no longer necessary. But, at the same time, it cannot be denied that as long as the Greek people, by a decision

of European diplomacy somewhat similar to that of Solomon, remain cut into two halves, equally deprived of life, Russia will always have an excellent hold over them, having in her grasp the Church of Constantinople, and threatening them with the thunders of excommunication every time they attempt to escape her influence. As long as the Greek race is feeble and dismembered, it is only by an effort that they can escape the preponderancy of Russia; but if the day ever comes when they shall reconquer the extent of territory and the unity which are their due, they will have reconquered, at the same time, their independence of all Russian tutorship. For if the name of religion is a means of action upon the ignorant people, the enlightened class understands perfectly that as soon as the whole of Greece is free, her religion has nothing to fear, and requires no protection whatsoever. This class is very numerous in Greece in proportion to the amount of population; so much so, that this little kingdom, with only its million of inhabitants, and its numbers of men capable, or thinking themselves capable of holding office, has often been likened to a small body with an enormous head. But this class have no sympathy with the despotic system of Russia, which they repulse as retrograde and unworthy of a free people; but, on the contrary, receiving all their ideas from the nations of Western Europe, they copy their institutions, and consider their influence as most salutary; and every time that that influence fails in its object, it ought to be attributed to the faulty policy which directs it rather than to the sentiments of the Greek people.

A short sketch of the relations of Greece with Russia and with England since her emancipation will prove the truth of this. The Greek revolution emerged with Ipsylanti from the very heart of Russia, and the hope of an active intervention of that power sustained his first steps. But the destruction of the expedition in the Wallachian provinces soon enlightened the Greeks, and gave them to understand that they were once more to be sacrificed by the Russians, who had urged them on, hoping that the times were ripe for their own projects. But this time, though abandoned, they determined to recoil no longer, and begun alone their long and glorious struggle with a feeling of bitterness against Russia, by whom they had been so often exposed without ever receiving help; and during the first years of the revolution that power was represented by no party, nor exercised the smallest influence in the country. In 1824, when a party was formed in Greece, who, looking to France, conceived the hope of sanctioning the revolution by calling to the head of the nation a prince of the house of Orleans, the present Duc de

Nemours; at the same time their political rivals formed an English party, which made the first step and committed the first fault of English policy in Greece. Great Britain, before any party took her interests, as it were, under their guardianship in the private intention of turning her influence to their own profit, was in Greece the object of universal sympathy. The Greeks recollected with enthusiasm that, when at their very worst, England alone had employed her omnipotence on the sea to come to their aid, that in their desperate struggle she had encouraged them with sympathy, and that she was the first to recognize their national independence. In 1824 then, when Ibrahim Pasha was devastating the Morea, and when Greece, on the brink of the precipice, would have considered as a saviour sent from heaven whoever extended a helping hand, had England given her disinterested aid, she might have established an influence as durable as legitimate. But the self-constituted friends of England in Greece, consulting their ambition rather than their strength, came forward with a proposal which was nothing less than a barter of the independence of their country against the first places which they aspired to hold therein. They presented a petition with a great number of signatures, demanding the exclusive protectorate of England as in the Ionian islands. This inconsiderate proceeding raised suspicions against the honourable and disinterested views of England, and excited all the national susceptibility. The austere and virtuous patriot, Ipsylanti, made a solemn protestation in the National Assembly; and though the English government wisely abstained from adhering to the petition, still their influence suffered severely, and the election of Count Capodistria by the Assembly of Egina was the counterblow of that impolitic act. But that election was no proof of the existence of a Russian party in Greece; for it was not as an adherent of that policy that Capodistria was chosen by the Greeks, but because he was their countryman; because he was preceded by a great reputation of capacity, and because for some time before he had declared his renunciation of the Czar and his policy; and to give a greater guarantee of his conversion, had retired to the lake of Geneva, as if to breathe the air of liberty. It was there that his election found him. With a skill which was quite peculiar, and which bore witness to his apprenticeship in the service of Russia, he succeeded in a short time in rooting himself firmly in the country, and in drawing round him, by the attraction of material interests, a great many elements of power. But no sooner was he so firmly established as to be obliged no longer to conceal under the mask of the democrat of Geneva the agent of the Emperor of Russia, than a tempest of opposition broke out against him, and except Colocotroni and a few Peloponn-

nesian military chiefs, who still upheld him, the nation rose like one man to repulse his policy. The aversion against the Russian system was not the work of a party, it was universal; and it is well known that this general feeling of indignation among the Greeks ended in the assassination of Capodistria. The opposition which was acting then so strongly against the Russian policy thus imposed on the Greeks, represented the only two parties (the English and the French) which had existed at all, till Capodistria himself formed a third. Prince Leopold, elected to the throne of Greece, was saluted with universal joy by the nation, though his intimate connexion with England was well known; and what excited against Capodistria the greatest animosity, was the discovery of the secret machinations by which he obtained the abdication of that prince, to whom he represented the people as impossible to govern, though he continued to govern them himself. It is evident, then, that the idea of the exclusive influence of Russia in Greece, founded on the identity of religion, is quite erroneous; that a party of that colour did not exist at all till formed by the head of the government himself, and that the balance of the political sympathies of the Greeks has always, on the contrary, leant towards England and France.

The death of the President allowed these two oppressed parties to appear in their true strength, but also with their respective weight. The Count Augustine Capodistria, who succeeded to his brother, remained at Nauplia surrounded by a handful of men, whilst the liberal government named in opposition to his, and who had retired in arms to the rocks of Perachora, were followed by almost all the distinguished statesmen and principal chiefs. But it then became evident that the French party had more real strength than the English. Though the latter had put themselves more forward in the opposition during the life of Capodistria, it was the former who played the principal part, when it became necessary to act, because they were in reality stronger. And this ought to have served as a lesson to the English party, not to put themselves imprudently forward, without measuring their strength. This is the secret of the bad success of English influence in Greece. The great fault of those who constitute and direct the English party has always been to mistake their own strength, and to pretend to a complete monopoly of power, to which they can never attain; and the great fault of the policy of the English government has been to follow them in that false line. The preponderancy of the French party proceeded, first, from the greater frequency of the commercial relations of Greece with France than with England; and, next, from the circumstance that the young men frequent by preference the universities of France, when more serious studies do not attract them to Germany; but

the principal reason for the greater development of the French party over the English, may be found in the different characters of the two men who have always been at the head of these two parties, and in the different lines of conduct which each of them have followed. In speaking of these two men, whose history, it may be said, is the political history of Greece, we shall try to paint them without allowing ourselves to be influenced by the high colouring given to them by parties prejudiced for or against them.

Coletti, born in Epirus, studied medicine in the universities of Italy, and returned to practise his profession at the court of the famous Ali Pasha of Jannina. It was there that he became connected with all the warlike chiefs of Roumelia; and being initiated in their projects for the approaching insurrection of the Greeks, soon obtained a very great influence over them. He was a man of serious and profound thought, and at the same time enthusiastic, and of great feeling. And as the chief strength of the Greek revolution lay in the Roumeliote warriors, Coletti, who had them at his disposal, acquired great weight in the destinies of his country. During the internal divisions which always ravaged Greece, even during her fiercest struggle against the Turks, Coletti's interest, as well as position, attached him to the party of the soldiers against the primates or landed proprietors; and he had always to combat the difficulties that the latter continually threw in the way of the defenders of their country, in their jealous fear lest the influence of the military chiefs should become greater than their own. It was thus, that at a time when all seemed lost, when Missolonghi was offered up as a holocaust to liberty, and Nauplia was almost the only town occupied by the Greeks, he formed the bold project of an invasion of the provinces occupied by the Turks; and having armed Caraïskaki, the greatest warrior whom modern Greece has produced, he had the happiness of contributing to the salvation of his country. This conduct attached the soldiers still more to him, and gained him the affection of the people, who, exasperated at the petty intrigues of personal ambition, and indignant at seeing the strength of the nation neutralized by internal quarrels, demanded loudly to march against the enemy, and enthusiastically applauded those who used their influence to that end.

Mavrocordato, the leader of the English party, bears the original and indelible stigma of being a Phanariote; this is sufficient to prevent his ever attaining to very great popularity. But all our readers may not be equally familiar with the signification of this term, which amounts to a sentence of condemnation in Greece. The Phanariotes were before the revolution the princes

or Grecian nobles at Constantinople, living in a quarter of the town called the Phanar. From among them were chosen the almost independent princes of Wallachia and Moldavia, and they directed all the foreign relations of the Ottoman empire with the European powers. They always employed their great influence in protecting their nation against the oppressor, in defending their privileges, and spreading the benefits of education by instituting schools all over Greece. The first idea of the Greek insurrection was conceived and fostered by them; they were almost all members of the Hetocria which prepared this movement, and as soon as it broke out, their blood was the first to be shed in torrents on the altar of their country's liberty. The Turks satiated on them and on the venerable Patriarch of the Church their first rage for vengeance. Of the few who escaped the carnage, some died sword in hand; others, as Negri, who was the author of the first code of laws which ruled free Greece, Mavrocordato, &c., have rendered signal services to their country. Such are the Phanariotes, and yet they are detested. This arises from those who, seeking to excite the popular feeling of the nation in preparation for the revolution, attacked as a means all aristocratic principles, and the class which was considered as representing them. This class was, therefore, cried down and calumniated, when it was no longer there to defend itself; the axe of the Turks had reduced it to silence. This was unjust, certainly, but it was so; and Mavrocordato has the disadvantage of belonging to this class. This circumstance, however, gave him on the other hand the advantage of a superior education, and he entered on his career with a much greater knowledge of the world than Coletti. Mavrocordato has an extremely subtle turn of mind, an insinuating character, great skill in turning to his own profit the interest and the weaknesses of others, and an ambition without bounds. He played an important part in the national assembly and provisional governments in which he had a share; but his party, for the double reason which we have just explained, always possessed less material strength than that of his rival, and ought never to attempt to combat alone.

But, though the English party may, in consequence of these circumstances, have less numerical force than the French, it does not the less exist, and has taken deep root in the country. And it now remains to be proved whether, on the institution of the royal government, it found in King Otho, as has been alleged, a prejudiced adversary systematically hostile to English policy; or whether its unsuccessfulness may not, after as well as before that period, be once more attributed to the false line which it con-

tinued to follow. The first relations of the King of Greece were with England. He arrived in his new kingdom on board an English frigate; and he then conceived such a friendship for his host of the Madagascar, that he asked as a particular favour that he should be chosen ambassador. It was thus that Sir Edmund Lyons changed his naval uniform for a diplomatic one. The person placed at the head of the regency was the Count Armansperg, formerly Bavarian ambassador in London; and when some months after the arrival of the Bavarians in Greece, the divisions in the regency rendered it indispensable that either the president or the members should be recalled, the court of Bavaria awarded the triumph to the former, who was well known to be attached to English policy. The Count Armansperg became from that moment the adherent or rather the idol of the British legation in Athens; all his acts were represented as prodigies; the golden age had returned to fortunate Greece, so much so, that when the Duc de Broglie proposed to give Greece a constitution, the English government answered that she had no occasion for it, notwithstanding that this country reputed to be so happy, was undergoing the consequences of the bad administration of the count. Inferior to the colleagues he had supplanted, he had neither the practical knowledge, the untarnished integrity, nor the philhellenic sentiments of Maurer; nor the habits of business and the great activity of Abel. His principal object was to maintain himself in power; he sought by every means to create adherents, and descending from the elevated position which belonged to the head of the government to the petty intrigues of a partizan, he shut his eyes to all abuses, tolerated the irregularity of the service, sacrificed public interest to that of his own preservation, and only sought to dazzle the country and foreigners by ordonnances full of sounding words, but emanating from an entire ignorance of the country, and a complete indifference to its wants. In short, his administration finished by destroying all the good effected during the first period of the regency, and putting every branch of the service into disorder. Still, however, the epoch of the presidency of Armansperg, was the most successful period of English policy in Greece. It was neither Mavrocordato nor the British legation that then represented that policy in Athens; it was the count himself. But he did so with moderation; he showed no exclusive preference for individuals, he persecuted no party, and no party had any interest in persecuting him, or rather he had reduced all parties pretty much into one—his own; and consequently he was strong against opposition from abroad, as that opposition would have had but little footing in the country; and if he had managed the affairs of Greece as well as he did his own

and those of England, his power and British influence might have lasted very long indeed. And this period of omnipotency has left in certain minds reminiscences and regrets, which have probably contributed to fix the line which English policy has since followed in Greece.

King Otho, on attaining his majority, still confided to Count Armansperg the direction of affairs, naming him high chancellor of state. It was, therefore, towards England that the young monarch bore him; but the vices of the administration were too flagrant. The king who, during his minority, had been kept carefully by Armansperg in ignorance of public affairs, began to see clearly for himself, and was not long in understanding all the faults of the system; and after much hesitation, yielded at length to evidence, and determined to dismiss a man who was in his name ruining the country. The king went to Germany for his marriage; the count, aware that his conduct was observed, began to entertain serious doubts as to the royal intentions towards him. At length he learnt by a secret dispatch, that King Otho had arrived at Corfu on his return, and was accompanied by a sort of councillor, who seemed far advanced in his good graces. Immediately the Greek public, who knew nothing of this fact, were surprised by unwonted symptoms of activity on the part of the high chancellor. A perfect shower of ordonnances, organizations, and regulations of the highest importance, fell upon all the branches of the administration. The count, fearful lest the king was bringing a successor to his office, inundated the government in the course of three or four days with all these ill-digested regulations, for the most part copied in haste from those of Bavaria; in order to prove that he had settled every thing during the king's absence, and that his successor would find nothing to do. But these hasty labours, of which one of his secretaries was the author, or rather the copier, bore the visible impress of the speed with which they had been compiled, and more than one branch of the public service suffers to this day from their imperfections. At the same time he caused the senate to vote an address to the king, in which it was said that Greece could not possibly be governed without the count, and demanding respectfully, but distinctly, a constitution. This constitution, which had been declared a superfluity in London as long as Armansperg was at the helm, was now put forward as a Medusa's head, to petrify the new councillor, and to bring the king repentant into the arms of the chancellor. But these machinations did not succeed, his cause was already decided.

In all this it was the circumstances, and not a coldness towards England, which caused the substitution of Budhart for Armansperg. It was one of those many changes of wind in politics

which circumstances bring about, and of which prudence, with patience and gentle means, get the better. On the contrary, it is especially since that time that the English policy in Greece has completely changed its character. A violent and vindictive line of conduct was adopted, which only embittered the mutual relations instead of re-establishing them; instead of trying to win back the Greek government by gentle means, and by acts of benevolence, which are always the surest ties, an offensive position was unskilfully taken up, which had the contrary result from what was intended, as it only threw Greece forcibly towards the other powers; and the end in view was rendered still more distant by the complete incorporation of the English interests with one of the factions of the country, whose passions were espoused, and the blame of whose faults became mutual. To make their principles prevail by persuasion or ability, ought to have been the object of the English government; on the contrary, they have attached their fate to that of a few individuals, whom they uphold by violent means. This is a double fault, a bad appreciation of the means by which influence is acquired or preserved. Budhart, it is true, leant towards Russia; but so evident is it that he was not chosen in the view of changing the line of foreign policy, that in spite of his estimable qualities, the king not finding in him the capacity and knowledge of business which he had expected, soon replaced him by a Greek ministry. All along King Otho still continued to show no repugnance to English policy, and never refused to return to it, when circumstances rendered it necessary. Armansperg had while in power sent, for reasons of his own, into an honourable exile all the *too* influential men. Coletti was sent to Paris; and Mavrocordato to Munich, and afterwards to London. But when, in 1841, King Otho determined upon making some fundamental changes in his system of government, which the wants and the development of the country demanded, and anxious at the same time to do every thing in his power to conciliate the good will of England, it was Mavrocordato whom he recalled, with the advice also of his brother, the present King of Bavaria, then in Greece, for the purpose of confiding to him that important task; which proves that neither the king nor the court of Bavaria, on whose inspiration he was supposed to act, had any prejudice against that statesman, or against the policy he represented. And that this ministry failed at its very outset, was no proof to the contrary, as the king made very considerable concessions to please Mavrocordato. He consented to suppress his cabinet; to dismiss from the court individuals in whom he had the greatest confidence; but he could not come to an understanding with him on the

modifications necessary in the state. It was a misfortune for Greece, and the king ought, perhaps, then to have yielded; but it was as much the form as the substance of the measures proposed that retained him. Mavrocordato presented them as a project determined on between himself and the cabinets of London and Paris, without the participation or knowledge of the king. Besides, these measures had the disadvantage of being most unpopular. In fact, when Mavrocordato was recalled to Greece, all eyes were fixed on him, no one doubting that he would demand the constitution, which had become the password of the English legation, since their influence over the government had escaped them, and thus save the country from the risk of a subsequent shock, in obtaining at once all that could be desired. It was, therefore, a cause of universal disappointment, when Mavrocordato only demanded several slight modifications in the council of state. Public opinion disavowed him at once, and the negotiations ended in his accepting the embassy to Constantinople, and the ministry being formed by Christides, on a simple promise from the king that he would prepare the constitution. This minister had formerly, it is true, been one of the friends of Coletti; but he always had an ambitious desire to stand alone, and then also hoisted his own standard, and deserted that of his ancient leader. He was then quite disposed to conciliate the English party, if they would have accepted his advances. But it was in vain; Christides, in the eyes of certain persons, had the unpardonable fault of not being Mavrocordato, and unfortunately the English policy in Greece, forgetting its own interests, already shared the interest and the prejudices of these individuals, and instead of treating with him, war was declared. Thus forced to look to his own defence, Christides turned for support to France, which, on the arrival of Piscatory in Greece, only agreed to support him in concert with England. But these efforts did not alter the English policy, and the British and Russian ambassadors, in combination, raised the excitement which ended in the revolution of September, 1843. However the king, faithful to his promise to Christides, did in fact employ himself in preparing a form of constitution adapted to the state of the country; and it is as little known, but a positive fact, that the revolution of September, 1843, broke out on the evening of the very day on which the king had announced to the foreign ambassadors that he had decided on proclaiming the constitution. And it is thought with reason, that those who having other ends in view, were interested in a revolution taking place in Greece, hurried on its explosion as soon as they knew that if another day passed it would be superfluous. However, this revolution was of little advantage to

its principal authors, at least, to those of the English party. In the first place, the unjust decree of the National Assembly, which excluded from all public offices all Greeks not born within the now free part of the country, deprived them of many of their advantages; besides, they fell once more into the same fault as before, by trying to grasp at more than their strength permitted. During the National Assembly, as long as Mavrocordato and Coletti from the gravity of the circumstances remained united, their influence was so great that all others were obliged to give way before them, and the king confided to them the formation of the cabinet. This ministry would have combined every possible element of strength; but it broke down on the division of the portfolios. Coletti proposed either that he should divide the offices in two parts, and that Mavrocordato should choose the share that suited his friends, or that Mavrocordato should divide the offices, and Coletti have the choice. So equitable a proposal was not accepted; and the king, compelled to choose between the two statesmen, decided for Mavrocordato, who composed his cabinet entirely of adherents to the English party. This was a serious error, as he was not strong enough to maintain himself thus isolated. Coletti promised to support him, and did so at first sincerely; but the new ministry seemed, as if purposely, to act so as to render this impossible. In the distribution of places, not only all the friends of M. Coletti were completely set aside, but all those who had employment were dismissed. The consequence was that all united to threaten Coletti that they would abandon him altogether, if he continued to support a ministry which acted in such a hostile manner towards them. All these circumstances would have been of very little consequence to the influence of England in Greece, if the policy of that nation had not been so completely identified with the individuals then in power, as to make its fate depend entirely upon theirs. The ministry was therefore supported to the utmost; all their acts were declared legitimate, the complaints of the other two parties were treated as seditious and calumnious, and their candidates in the elections were denounced in every possible way as enemies to order. In spite of all this, however, the ministry was too weak to stand, having to combat two factions, each of which were stronger than itself; and besides, what gave the finishing stroke to its unpopularity, was the barefaced manner in which the elections of the first chamber of deputies were interfered with: it is true, that these accusations were denied as calumnious; but a letter from the minister of justice, which was discovered and published in the newspapers, proved their truth, and caused so much scandal, that the retreat of the ministers became inevitable.

They only lasted a few months longer, and fell before a popular riot, in which King Otho presented himself courageously to the crowd, and only succeeded in preventing the effusion of blood, by promising to change his ministry. It is then evident by all that precedes, that King Otho at several different periods called the English party to the direction of affairs, that he never treated them as enemies, and that he was always ready to give them their equal share of power when they were willing to accept it.

M. Coletti and M. Metana, chief of the Russian party, succeeded to the Mavrocordato ministry; but had those who directed the policy of England in Greece done so with greater skill and coolness, they might have foreseen that this forced alliance could not last, and that, with a little patience, the French party must come round again to them. On the contrary, the fallen faction let loose all their fury against their successors; no means was spared to overthrow them; their newspapers were crowded with the most revolting accusations; their tone became even seditious, and at length they ended in using open revolt as an arm.

In 1845, a wise and moderate speech of Lord Aberdeen's, in the House of Lords, repelling the bitter accusations of Lord Beaumont against the Greek government, produced the greatest effect in Greece, was spoken of in the two chambers of that country with gratitude, and turned anew all the sympathy of the Greeks towards England, with the hope that the English government did not perhaps share the errors of the legation, who were becoming more and more the dupe and the organ of the ambition of certain individuals. But since 1846, and the formation of the present ministry in England, the evil received a still greater augmentation, and emanated from a higher source. Lord Palmerston saw with the eyes of Sir Edmund Lyons, who saw with those of the Greek opposition. From that moment all the diatribes of the journals of that party (and the *sycophants* of modern Greece are well worthy of their ancestors) were embodied in the despatches, and often became the subject of violent notes. The greatest exaggerations, the most monstrous fables, were put into the mouths of the orators of both houses of Parliament, and in substance confirmed by Lord Palmerston. In consequence of this system, the most vexatious demands were addressed without ceasing to the Greek government, and leaving them neither rest nor respite. This was certainly not the most skilful way of conducting the affairs of England in Greece. The most influential party being in power, the English government ought to have kept on good terms with it,—to have tried to win it, not to combat with it. England was loved in the country,—they ought not

to have alienated that affection: her influence was established on anterior benefits conferred,—they ought not to have destroyed it, nor to have made it depend on the fall of such or such a party; they ought not to have confided it to the patronage, and united it to the fate of a faction; above all, since that faction put as a condition to its existence the overthrow of the throne: for, since the death of Coletti, the opposition have taken a still more significant attitude. It is no longer against the ministry, but against the king himself, that their attacks are now directed. All this, for England, is like seeking, by the most thorny, the longest or perhaps an altogether impossible road, to obtain what is already within her grasp. Even were all the recriminations of the Greek opposition indubitably true, England ought to have limited herself to advising, to exhorting, remembering that advice given with a good grace is generally received in the same manner, keeping completely out of party quarrels, and not giving the lie to the good-will which the English have always shown to Greece.

But it may, perhaps, be said that it is precisely the interest which the English government take in the prosperity of the Greek people that makes them consider it as a duty to raise their voice in their defence, and to sacrifice their relations with a government which is ruining the country, by taking the side of the opposition which promises to save it. This point of view, if it really is the true one, certainly does honour to their philanthropy; but it also obliges us to give a rapid glance at the principal accusations brought against the Greek government and its chief, and to examine how far they are conformable to truth, and serious enough to justify the extreme severity of the English policy; and whether the latter has not, with too easy confidence, admitted as a rule of conduct the inventions, or at least the exaggerations of party spirit.

An opinion received without contestation by all those to whom the Greek opposition journals serve as an authority, is, that King Otho is devoid of even the most common-place intelligence. This is so well accredited, particularly in England, that an assertion to the contrary would probably be treated as a paradox: yet we are firmly persuaded, that if all the ministers who have ever served under King Otho were to be interrogated, they would not bear witness to his want of intelligence. What they particularly complain of in him is the excessive perspicuity with which he distinguishes the most minute details in an affair, and often startles and embarrasses them excessively by the most unexpected, but often the most just objections. If this is not a kingly virtue, for too great an attention to details smothers the whole, and disturbs the general point of view, it is certainly

a proof of subtlety and penetration in the intellectual faculties of the King of Greece. As to his other qualities, his love of justice is proverbial in Greece, and acknowledged even by his enemies: he often carries it to an excess which almost becomes a fault; for in a king, who ought to combine all things in such a manner as to hold the balance equal between opposing interests, every excess, even that of a virtue, may be considered as a fault. His humanity cannot be contested any more than his justice; he has perhaps abused, if one may say so, his privilege of pardon, and never seriously punished a political crime. Successive amnesties have always re-instated all those whom the law had condemned for reasons of this nature, and it has even been said that so much clemency resembled weakness. His private life is of a most exemplary austerity; on this head the court of Greece has indeed exercised a most salutary influence on the morality of the higher society of that new-born nation. In fine, it is also beyond doubt that King Otho is gifted with great natural intrepidity. On the night of the 15th Septemper, 1843, and in the riot of the 16th of August, 1844, he presented himself courageously to the mob; and at all times, when the opposition is declaiming against his person in the most violent manner, both in the newspapers and in the taverns, he is to be seen traversing the town almost alone and with the most perfect calmness. But, of course, the medal has also its reverse. The indecision and temporizing of King Otho are well known, and are often a serious hindrance to the regular march of the government. But these faults spring also from his punctilious equity, which makes him never decide upon any thing until he has examined every thing himself, weighed every thing; for his attachment to the country he governs is deep and sincere,—so much so, that it has often been said by those who lose patience at the disastrous intrigues of some individuals, who may truly be called the enemies of their country, that King Otho is the most true Greek at heart in the kingdom.

Another accusation which the opposition direct against the king himself, in order to take from him the affection of the people, is, that he accepted the constitution with hypocritical intentions, and that he is working secretly to destroy it. The constitution of Greece is far from being a master-piece as regards the country, and the result has proved it; but, such as it is, it is indispensable; and King Otho having once admitted it as the fundamental law of his kingdom, whoever is acquainted with his character and his religious strictness in every thing concerning an oath or a promise, never could believe the aim of his policy to be that of which he is accused. The revolution of 1843, in which

he had been forced to resign himself even to thank and decorate the troops who had risen in revolt against him, had shaken the throne to its very foundation; and, to save the country from impending anarchy, the most urgent necessity was to give back to royalty a part of the prestige and strength it had lost. Mavrocordato, the first to whom the task was committed, would not or could not acquit himself of it. Instead of trying to raise the king, he seemed rather resolved to humiliate him still more: he imposed upon him, in his own palace, as aide-de-camp, the General Callergi, the leader of the revolt; and as orderly officer in waiting, an infantry lieutenant, who, in the tumult, crowned with roses, like a Bacchus, had the insolence to hold out a bottle of wine to the queen, who was at the window of the palace, for her to drink to the Constitution. In short, Mavrocordato, during the few months of his administration, weighed upon the throne with all the weight of his unpopularity. Coletti, who succeeded him, saw that the safety of the state was at stake; that not a moment must be lost, and no means spared to prop up the throne with all the elements of strength that were to be found in the country. This was the first necessity; every thing else was secondary. He surrounded the king with the greatest possible respect, and tried to rally round the government all the depositaries of strength and influence, be they whom they might, such as General Tzavella, Colocotroni, Glaraki in the Russian party, and Stratos in the English. He repulsed those of his ancient friends, who, like Generals Grivas and Grisiotti, thought they might impose their pretensions on the royal authority; and it ought not to appear surprising that he took from Sir Richard Church the very important post of commander-general of the forces; for, though a most excellent man, he belonged to the least moderate faction of the opposition; and he left him his rank in the army, which was afterwards resigned, and his place as senator. When the opposition raised the rebellion of Grivas first, and then of Grisiotti, Coletti succeeded, in a few days, in quieting these disturbances; and the English policy being then hostile to Greece, he assured to the government the support of France, Russia, Austria, Prussia, and Bavaria. These were services sufficiently important to explain the trust that King Otho placed in this minister, without considering it as the reward of a plot woven against the constitution. Besides, had this plot existed, M. Coletti and the king must have been very skilful never to allow the slightest trace of it to appear, and very unskilful never to have tried to put it into execution. The Coletti ministry, named after the elections had been terminated under the auspices of M. Mavrocordato, yet disposed of a very compact

majority; still that majority was never employed to destroy the constitution. A year later, the opposition, profiting by the discontent of several deputies, who had supposed that their position authorized them to make the most exaggerated personal demands, succeeded in gaining them over against the ministry, whom they thought thus to constrain to every concession; but the opposition, thus augmented, chose an unfortunate field of battle in opposing the highly popular mode of tax-gathering which the ministry had proposed. M. Coletti preferred dissolving the chamber, and consulting the nation; and the nation answered by a general manifestation of confidence in electing a chamber in which the opposition was scarcely represented at all. As far as this, there was nothing unconstitutional.

But here the opposition entrenched themselves in their last stronghold; the senate had been constituted under the ministry of M. Mavrocordato, and almost exclusively of his friends. In the answer to the king's speech, the senate chose therefore to attack the lower chamber, declaring it illegally elected. Such a collision between the two legislative bodies would have been the ruin of the constitution, and might have the most fatal results. The king declared to the senate that he could not accept such an address: this was cried out against as a violation of the constitution, whereas in reality it was its salvation. But the opposition from thenceforward continued to declare the chamber illegal, the ministry guilty of having interfered in the elections, and the king the author of all the evil for having tolerated and directed these proceedings. It is not necessary to be very deeply versed in the theory of constitutional government to understand that the ministers being alone responsible, the king has no right to oppose their acts, until the nation has pronounced against them by the voice of the parliament. Besides, if we are correctly informed, and we believe we are so, the intervention so much blamed of the Coletti ministry was not that of violence, but on most occasions the simple expression of the desire of the government with regard to the candidate to be preferred; and almost every where the people returned the ministerial candidate, which proved nothing else than that the people, tired of internal divisions, only wished the stability of order, and placed implicit confidence in the government. According to the opposition, however, the chamber was illegal, the ministry supported by it was in good logic anti-national, and the king who maintained the one and the other an enemy to the constitution and the leader of a party. And the truth of this they tried to prove by three successive revolts, which if they proved any thing it was quite the contrary, for the nation repulsed them. That King Otho should maintain a ministry sup-

ported by the parliament of the country, and by the great majority of the foreign diplomacy, was, in our opinion, as prudent as it was constitutional; and that he had become the leader of a party was disproved, when, after the death of Coletti, he immediately thought of, and in the month of March last, finally proposed to Mavrocordato to form a cabinet, notwithstanding that the newspapers of his party were full of the most malignant insinuations against the king himself, whom they represented as the author of all the evils that were, according to them, destroying the country. But Mavrocordato annexed to his acceptance conditions which gave it to be understood, that the opposition had something quite different in view from the mere change of the ministry. He demanded the dissolution of the chamber, and a general amnesty for all the rebels. But the chamber had already been dissolved the year before; and the exercise of the royal prerogative of dissolution twice in the space of one parliamentary period, is a constitutional anomaly, almost a violation of the will of the nation, not to speak of the financial embarrassments it would indubitably cause. Besides, the late events in France had caused such excitement in the country, that it was not without very great danger that new elections could have been attempted; besides it was unnecessary, as the chamber promised to support the new ministry, and at the same time the king offered them an act of dissolution to be had the moment that promise was transgressed; but Mavrocordato insisted. In the same manner he insisted on the general amnesty, in spite of the observation that continued impunity was lowering the consideration of the government and emboldening crime, and that this measure would bring back into the country a horde of dangerous and perhaps ill-intentioned men. But the king finally ended in sacrificing prudence to humanity, and yielded this point, though the result was soon seen. No sooner had the protégés of the opposition received their pardon, than they passed the frontiers as rebels, bringing even Turks to overthrow the throne. However, King Otho not having come to terms with Mavrocordato, not the less changed his ministry, and formed the new cabinet from among the more moderate of the English party; which is another proof that he did not systematically avoid that party, and that if Mavrocordato is not at the head of affairs, it is his own fault. But what characterises the line followed by the English policy in Greece is, that scarcely was this ministry formed when it was disowned, because one man was wanting in it. Every thing for him, nothing without him.

We cannot pass in silence another accusation against the king of Greece and his ministers, which has furnished ample matter for the opposition. It is, that the country is infested by numerous

brigands liberated by Coletti. During Mavrocordato's ministry the rather cavalier manner in which the elections were watched over, had exasperated and roused to arms many individuals; perhaps the then opposition was not perfectly innocent in this, but any way the government treated these men as brigands, and in that they were to a certain degree right. But when the then opposition became in their turn government, these men, who had no further reason for discontent, demanded their pardon; and the Coletti ministry knowing well they were not brigands, and not caring to have to reduce them by force when they were ready to yield of their own accord, pardoned them. The opposition, therefore, cried loudly for two years that Coletti had covered Greece with brigands, whom he had in his pay to serve his own purposes; and Mr. Baillie Cochrane several times repeated the same in parliament. But, in the first place, it is singular, that these same brigands should have been every where pursued and exterminated by the very government who was supposed to keep them in pay; secondly, that all those who were caught, or whose name was known, happened to be by their antecedents in connexion with the leaders of the opposition; and, finally, that that very opposition, who raised such cries of holy horror against the amnesty of those whom they called brigands, lately annexed as a condition to their acceptance of power a general amnesty and without restriction, to several hundreds of real brigands.

To complete the picture of ferocious tyranny of which King Otho is accused, it has been often repeated in England, and was the great hobby of Mr. Baillie Cochrane, that that prince rejoiced in the blood of his subjects and delighted in torture. But this extraordinary accusation must have been generally treated as a calumny, or it would have awakened all over Europe a cry of horror against a prince, who, in the middle of the nineteenth century, ventured to renew the amusements of Nero; and the Greeks must be wonderfully inconsistent to have fought ten years against the Turks, and now submit to a king who orders them to be tortured. But no, there is not a single man who has known the King of Greece, who would not repulse such a calumny. We have already said that his fault is, an excess of humanity.

It is, above all, a certain Tzino, a captain of gendarmerie, who is said to be the executor of these acts of tyranny. This Tzino is a very active officer, who extirpated the brigandage in Acarnania, where that evil is endemic. Did he always do so with the code of laws in his hand? Perhaps not; for, from the habits and peculiar circumstances of that province, with legal forms he never would have caught a single brigand. It seems that he found the best way to take the brigands was to attack those who concealed

them, which he did by extra-judicial means, such as lodging his soldiers in their houses, &c.; and though these means may seem irregular in a regularly organized society, in Arcanania they never failed in their effect. And the best proof that this officer never employed torture, nor committed any act of barbarity that could be complained of, is, that when the late ministry recalled him from that province, the inhabitants earnestly solicited by successive petitions his return, as being the only officer capable of insuring public safety. All the horrible stories which have been told of him, were at the time contradicted by the official journals in Greece, as gratuitous inventions of those whom he prevented from exciting disturbances; and yet not the less, every time the Greek loan is taken into consideration in either house of parliament these stories re-appear, to heighten the interest of certain harangues, by giving them a more dramatic turn.

In short, the Greek opposition and their upholders elsewhere have done and said so much, that it is now a generally received idea by some, that Greece is a sort of political abortion, destined to die of inanition; by others, that a bad government has dried up in her the sources of life, has made her go back in the path of civilization and prosperity, has squandered her resources, and fraudulently subtracted, or foolishly dilapidated the funds with which they ought to acquit the debt due to the European powers. That Greece does not possess the conditions of existence is a great error. Excepting her small extent, and consequently her political weakness, she possesses advantages that are wanting to many countries larger than herself. Her position and her geographical conformation, her situation with regard to the populations of Turkey, the fertility of her soil, her fortunate climate, the intelligence and activity of her inhabitants, their degree of civilization, and even their small number in proportion to the extent of their territory, are sources of prosperity so abundant, that the plague of pauperism, which consumes the kingdoms of Europe, is almost entirely unknown. The second question now remains to be examined, whether all those benefits bestowed by nature on Greece, are not lost to her through a government which represses her development, and throws her resources to the wind. The too impatient friends of Greece, as well as her too exacting creditors, may reasonably regret that her progress is not more rapid; but it is also just to inquire whether it could easily have been so, and how far it could be asked of the government. The successive diminution which may be remarked for some years past in the revenues of the country, is undoubtedly an alarming symptom; the existence of the evil is undeniable, but the cause to which it has been attributed is not so. If, as it has been pretended, the primary cause is the King of Greece himself, or the

government acting at his instigation, this diminution ought to have manifested itself, above all, during the reign of absolutism, and not since the constitution has set bounds to the royal power; yet it is the contrary that has taken place. It is since 1843 that the financial position has become worse. The people pay more, and the treasury receives less. Before the revolution the receipts were gradually augmenting, and in 1840 the revenue had risen to seventeen millions of drachms, (about 671,000*l.* sterling,) and the state was then able to pay three and a half millions of the interest of the foreign debt. From 1844 to 1847, on the contrary, the revenue has diminished gradually to thirteen, twelve, eleven, and finally to nine and a half millions. It is therefore evident, that nothing can be more unjust, than to lay on King Otho the blame of the squandering and consequent reduction of the revenue. Nor can the Coletti ministry, who governed the country from 1845 to 1847, bear that blame, as these afflicting symptoms in the finances had already begun in 1844. It is, therefore, elsewhere that the reason is to be sought for, and the epoch of their first appearance furnishes it at once.

We are far from admitting the doctrine of a certain absolute sovereign, who styled a representative constitution a system of corruption. A constitution, applied to Greece according to her real wants and her local circumstances, composed by disinterested men, having nothing in view but the good of the country, would be the greatest boon that could be granted to the country. That of 1843 is a production of theory, admitted in Greece on the faith and example of other nations; having nothing in common with her, neither her morals, nor her wants, nor her social condition. In France, and still more in England, influence and capacity go together; and the representative elections send to the capital a contingent of learning, probity, experience, and knowledge of local wants. Malversation, in the exercise of public functions, is branded as the most infamous of actions. In Greece, on the contrary, in the present state of society, influence, at least local influence, is quite distinct from capacity. The former is to be found in the provinces among men who are in immediate contact with the people, and not very far distant from them by their education or their amount of learning; the other is concentrated almost exclusively in Athens among men who have no immediate connexion with the provinces. It was to these last that before the constitution the functions in the State were principally confided, as their superior education, their greater erudition, their respect for their duty, were a warrant of their probity. But, since the nomination of the ministers depends upon the deputies, and the election of the deputies depends upon the electors, whose ideas of right and wrong have been considerably influenced

by the system of disorder under which they had grown up, and who cannot yet comprehend that the right they exercise is a precious privilege which they ought to be careful of profaning, it is no longer capacity, but influence, that is demanded of those who are at the head of affairs,—the influence of the ministers upon the deputies, the influence of the deputies upon the electors. And as, in a struggle between two equally influential candidates, the highest bidder gains the day, the deputy is named by dint of promises, and the ministry supported by dint of concessions; and, consequently, the embezzlement of the public fortune is all the more certain result of this constitutional game, that the ministers thus elected have rarely the capacity necessary to prevent it. M. Metaxa, when Minister of Finance in 1845, changed the mode of raising the revenue, which, as Greece has no register of lands, had always been done in a most primitive manner by farming out the taxes at a public auction. This manner, by which a third person was interposed between the contributary and the state, was extremely vexatious to the people, and highly unpopular. The ministry, yielding to the exclamations of the deputies, substituted for it the system of collecting the taxes directly by government agents. But as the choice of these collectors was generally imposed upon the minister by the influence of the deputies, and the finance officers in the provinces were more or less their creatures, collectors and officers play into each other's hands; and the treasury has undergone such enormous losses, that for 1848 the Government has been obliged to go back to the old plan of farming the revenue. Yes, it cannot be denied. It is that constitution which the English ministry rejected when their friends Armansperg or Mavrocordato were in power, and which they imposed on Greece when Christides was at the head of affairs, that is the principal cause of the diminution in the revenue, and the daily increasing difficulty which that country finds in acquitting her debt to the foreign powers, and particularly to England, her severest creditor. King Otho and his Government have often been accused of being fraudulent debtors, of wishing by subterfuges to avoid paying their debt, and of wasting in useless expenses the sums destined thereunto. Such a reproach is a disgrace to the honour of a private individual, and still more so to that of a nation or a government; and those who make it should be very sure that it is not on the faith of unfounded calumnies that they give up to public reprobation a nation which rather claims interest for its involuntary misfortunes,—a Government, which has a right to approbation for the desperate perseverance with which it struggles against insurmountable difficulties. Though it seems to us beneath the dignity of England thus to place her heel twice a year on the neck of Greece, to force that

noble creation of the sympathy of Europe to pay the miserable sum of 20,000*l.*, still we cannot contest her right, or even that it is her duty, before taking upon herself a foreign debt, to examine why she does so. To appreciate justly the obligations which the loan imposes upon Greece, one must recollect the circumstances under which it was contracted, and the manner in which it was disposed of.

It was in 1833 that England, France, and Russia, in constituting the kingdom of Greece, determined at the same time to sustain it by a loan of sixty-six millions of drachmas (2,000,000*l.*). This subsidy was without doubt generous and indispensable: royalty required this support to acquire authority; the young state, after the ravages of the war, and the oppression of past ages, could not have attempted without this help a regular organisation. But this loan was less destined to defray the regular expenses of the country than to re-open the obstructed sources of national wealth, to create new resources, to make the land bear fruit, to enliven commerce and develop industry; and if it did not produce more than the annual sum of its own interest, it was not only useless, but certain to bring the country to bankruptcy; as it was impossible to expect that the interest, amounting to 3,800,000 drachmas a year, could ever come out of the limited revenue of the country.

The Greek nation was not consulted when this debt was contracted; and, indeed, it was not necessary, as it was not possible that such a benefit could be rejected. But what is infinitely more important is, that the nation was not consulted either on the use to be made of it. Though the war of emancipation had been extended by the Greeks at different periods of the revolution, even to the summit of Mount Athos, still the great powers, in their solicitude for the pacification of the East, decided that damages for the national property of the provinces, not occupied by Greek troops on the arrival of Capodistria, should be paid by Greece to Turkey to the amount of twelve millions and a half; and this they gave beforehand out of the loan. But the land thus purchased by the State was far from being worth this enormous sum, and did not yield more than a very small part of the interest of it, as all the most fertile lands in these provinces belonged to individual Turks, who sold them, on their own account, to Greeks or foreigners. Besides this, the charges on the realization and administration of the loan were enormous, and produced a loss to the Greeks, for negotiations, commissions, coinage, &c., of about 5,750,000 drachmas[1]. Out of the same

[1] A drachma is worth eightpence halfpenny. There are twenty-eight drachmas in a pound sterling.

loan were also retained all advances made formerly either by governments or private individuals, amounting to nearly 2,500,000 drachmas; and, lastly, the interest and sinking fund of the first year was subtracted from the capital; and when, after 1836, Greece was no longer able to pay the interest and sinking fund, they were deducted from the third instalment of the loan which had not yet been sent to Greece. In this manner, of the sixty-six millions of debt which weigh upon Greece, she only received in reality 19,612,000 drachmas; and even of that sum, from the year 1833 to 1836, were paid back, in interest and sinking fund, 7,163,408 drachmas. From which it follows that Greece, of whom is required the yearly payment of the interest of a debt of sixty-six millions of drachmas, did not, in fact, receive or apply to her wants more than twelve millions and a half. But did Greece profit even by the poor remains of this unlucky bounty? Our readers shall judge. According to the decision of the protecting powers, who did not ask the opinion of the Greeks, the regency arrived in Greece with a Bavarian army, and disbanded the native troops. It was thought that the safety of the new throne required this measure; but this was a great mistake. The halo which surrounded royalty, the general enthusiasm of the people, their weariness of internal divisions, and the recollection of the recent evils of anarchy, would have defended the throne much more efficaciously than all the German bayonets, and would have left the Government time to give the country a good military organization. The disbanded soldiers became brigands, and ravaged the country; and the presence of the foreigners caused two revolts, which the Bavarians could not quell, not being acquainted either with the country or with the tactics of the Greeks, who beat them completely. This foreign army cost eight millions in 1833, nine millions in 1834, and six millions and a half in 1835; whereas, from 1836, when the king dismissed them, the war department did not cost more than four millions. This, therefore, is what became of the loan of sixty-six millions of drachmas. We recapitulate, to make the statement more distinct:—

	Drachmas.
To the Turks for the purchase of the public property in Phthiotis	12,500,000
Non valeurs and charges on the realization of the loan	5,750,000
Retained for former advances made to Greece	2,500,000
Interest and sinking fund paid by Greece	7,150,000
Interest and sinking fund retained on the capital ..	26,000,000
To the Bavarian army (addition to the budget from 1833 to 1835)	11,500,000
Total	65,400,000

This, therefore, was the present made by Europe to Greece on constituting her as an independent state—a passive debt without an active balance, the interest of which amounts to a quarter of her annual revenue in the most prosperous years! And with this immense, this impossible burden, she is told to advance; she is accused of not advancing more rapidly; and the government of King Otho is blamed for her slow progress, whereas it ought rather to excite astonishment that so feeble a bark has not long since been submerged; and, at the least, interest should be awarded to the pilots who make such efforts to keep her afloat. But whatever may be said to the contrary, it is not the less certain that Greece, in spite of the weight thus hung round her neck, is advancing. That she should not yet have attained the degree of prosperity enjoyed by the most civilized nations of Europe, cannot surprise those who reflect that a country coming out of a slavery of several ages by a war of extermination, cannot arrive in the space of fifteen years at the point to which other nations have attained by the continued efforts of many centuries. And it is but just also to keep in mind the unfavourable circumstances which have even in that short space of time impeded the development of the Greek people. The discord between the members of the regency, the unskilful and interested administration of Count Armansperg, the financial crisis always impending from the demands for the interest of the loan, and, lastly, the revolution of 1843, the work of a party and the result of the encouragement it had received. Yet, notwithstanding all these obstacles, it is impossible not to acknowledge that the progress is great.

The successive augmentation of the revenue during the first eight years is proof sufficient.

In 1833 the revenue amounted to about	7,700,000	drachmas.
1834	11,100,000	"
1835	13,600,000	"
1836	13,600,000	"
1837	13,900,000	"
1838	14,300,000	"
1839	15,500,000	"
1840	17,500,000	"

A gradual augmentation from seven and a half millions to seventeen and a half would be inexplicable, did one not admit at the same time an equally growing prosperity, a proportional development in all the branches of national activity, and the salutary influence of the Government. And facts prove what we advance. During the oppression of the Turks, Greek commerce was not very extensive; but the sailors of that country, whose skill and

intrepidity is well known, profited by the wars which accompanied and followed the French revolution, made immense profits, and created for themselves a very considerable mercantile navy. When the Greek revolution broke out they offered their riches to their country, and changed their merchant vessels into fireships, which reduced their navigation and commerce to an extremely low state. After the arrival of King Otho, and the return of order and liberty, the efficacy of the measures taken by the government gave them a new life. By the reform in the system of coins, weights, and measures, the opportunities of fraud disappeared, and confidence was re-established in small traffic; it was also re-established in trade by the suppression of piracy, by the punishments inflicted on barratry, by the establishment of insurance companies; and on the exterior, the interests of commerce were protected by treaties made with almost all the powers of Europe, which put Greeks on a footing with the most favoured nations. Three elective chambers of commerce were instituted to give their advice on all questions concerning the interests of that branch of national activity. The French code was adopted as the law regulating the commercial transactions in Greece, and commercial lawsuits were sent to special tribunals, the judges being chosen from a list presented by the merchants. Finally, the import duty from one Greek port to another was suppressed as an illiberal impediment; and the tariff of the export and import duties, which oppressed the commerce, was modified. These measures of course produced their fruit; and the value of the imports, exports, transit, and coasting trade of the kingdom of Greece, which in 1833 was 26,800,000 drachmas, rose in 1840 to 78,800,000.

In the docks of Syra, the Piræus, Egina, and the islands, a most extraordinary activity reigns; and for several years past the mercantile navy has augmented at the rate of 600 ships, great and small, every year. The total number of ships is about 3000 of about 100 tons' weight, and more than 12,000 smaller for the coasting trade; and the freight of ships for long voyages during this year amounts to 12,000,000 drachmas.

Let us turn to the agriculture of Greece. Under the Turks the Greeks cultivated with a bad grace the crops they were never to reap; during the war of independence the greater part of the land remained uncultivated, but since their freedom the Greeks have busied themselves actively about their agriculture, and their government has given them every encouragement. It has instituted a model farm and nursery garden, which furnishes fruit-trees to the whole of Greece; it has granted to every peasant a stremma (1000 French square metres) of land for his garden free of tax; it has permitted whoever chooses to cultivate the national

lands without previous authorization, provided they pay a slight additional tax; the plantations have been protected by severe laws against the destruction of trees; and regulations have been published to facilitate colonization. Before the revolution of 1843 the government had undertaken to drain several marshes, that of a part of the lake Copaïs with the greatest success, and also that of Elis; at the same period several roads were constructed, from Athens to Livadia, to Megara, and several begun in the Peloponnesus. But there still remained without doubt wants which it was not in the power of the government to satisfy; for instance, there are about 100,000 families of labourers in Greece, and there are not more than 25,000 yoke of oxen. It would be necessary then to procure 75,000 more, so that each family might have a pair to cultivate the portion of land which falls to its share; but this would cost a sum of 30,000,000 of drachmas, which would have been much better paid out of the loan, than giving it all to the Turks, to European bankers, and to useless soldiers. However, agriculture continues to flourish. We shall only quote as examples of this two of the most important productions of the country.

Greece in	1832	produced	4,000,000	lbs. of currants.
"	1840	"	10,000,000	"
"	1845	"	15,500,000	"
"	1846	"	24,500,000	"
"	1847	"	32,000,000	"

This quantity is the produce of nearly 64,000 stremmas of vineyard in full bearing; there is besides this a great number of young plantations which have not yet borne fruit. The exportation of silk amounted in 1835 to 400,000 drachmas, or 8000 okes (about three pounds to an oke), at the rate of fifty drachmas an oke—

In 1838 to	716,000	drachmas, or	14,320	okes.
1839	910,000	"	18,200	"
1847	2,250,000	"	45,000	"

These quantities are those of the exportation, but the real produce of last year amounts to 100,000 okes, a great part being consumed in the country, and some is smuggled out.

Several millions of trees have been imported into Greece from Italy since 1835, besides all those furnished by the royal nursery ground.

The government might be accused of greater negligence with regard to the manufactures, and the opposition has not failed to do so; but even this is not altogether just. The reason of the

slow progress of this branch of national activity will be better understood if one considers, that of the whole male population of Greece, amounting to about 200,000 grown men, 100,000 are husbandmen, and more than 50,000 are sailors and merchants; which proves that the principal attention of the nation is turned in the two directions which the nature of their country indicates to them. Their natural good sense tells them that they should do ill to leave the ready and abundant resources which they have within their reach, to seek others which are problematical. Manufacture is a means, not an end; it is the means which nations employ to enrich themselves, but if they have others easier and more productive, they are not wrong in preferring them. But with all this the national industry has not been entirely neglected. The government has instituted a board of manufactures, and a school of arts and trades, and sent young men to different parts of Europe to be educated in the manufactures. That which has made the greatest progress is the silk spinning, which is established on a great scale in Messenia, at the Piræus, and at Athens, with excellent machines and a much improved method, which has doubled the value of this produce.

A national bank established in 1840 has also much contributed to the development of the country by lending at a much lower rate than the legal interest of money.

The intellectual state of Greece is most flourishing. She possesses a complete legislation, civil, penal, and commercial codes based upon the French legislature, and modified to suit the country; excellent tribunals have been instituted, and all the legal functionaries before the constitution were perfectly well chosen, but unfortunately not for life. The church of Greece has been detached from that of Constantinople in all matters of Church government; and an independent administrative synod, composed of a president and four bishops elected annually, has been instituted, to the great discomfit of the Russians and their party. Public instruction is highly developed; 30,000 children frequent 312 primary schools supported by government, besides 5000 instructed in private schools, and 10,000 students pursue their studies in sixty-six grammar schools, four excellent gymnasiums or high schools, and a university of thirty professorships, besides the military, and several other special schools. An idea may be formed of the progress of science in Greece from the fact, that in Athens there exist five scientific societies patronised by the king, one of which is a sort of academy like that of France. And to complete this sketch of the steps made by Greece in the path of progress, we may add, that at the end of the revolution almost all her towns were destroyed, and have now all risen from their ruins,

even the villages have been entirely rebuilt. Athens counts at the present day more than 5000 houses, not one of which subsisted before the arrival of the king.

But it may be asked if Greece then, in spite of all her difficulties, has not retrograded under the royal government, why does she not apply a part of her revenue to pay the interest of her debt? Is it from dishonesty? or is it from necessity? We have seen that the year the revenue rose to seventeen millions, the surplus was employed not on useful and productive works, but to pay the interest of the debt. But when the revenue scarcely covers the expenses indispensable to the service of the state, it cannot be expected to commit suicide by depriving itself of these expenses, provided they be really no more than indispensable. And to prove this we have only to examine the budget, which contains nothing but the most urgent expenses. The principal items are as follows:—

1,426,000 drs. for the civil list and the salaries of the members of Parliament.

4,430,000 ,, for the war department. Greece has twelve principal fortresses besides several smaller, in all of which, as well as in the principal towns, she requires garrisons; also an extensive open frontier, which must be guarded by a continued cordon. The Greek army all in all is not 8000 men, the minimum which can suffice to her wants.

1,157,000 ,, for the navy, which ought to be the principal strength of the young kingdom, and which contains only fourteen vessels large and small, and a service of 600 men. To this are only added the indispensable reparations, and the building of a single brig of twenty cannons.

1,791,000 ,, for the home department, who, besides the expense of the administration, public safety, the prisons, the post offices, keeping up of existing roads, and some relief to the indigent, there is only added a small part of a sum for the building of an establishment for the public offices, in order to save the annual rents now paid.

450,000 ,, for the foreign office, containing only the consulships and four legations.

The rest of the budget contains only the expenses of the tribunals, schools, the clergy, and the finance officers. It is therefore evident that it would be impossible to cut off any of the annual expenses of the state, without paralysing the service, and exposing the country to serious danger. If Greece cannot fulfil

the engagements she has been made to contract, it is not from want of will, but from want of power. But if she were left to herself to enjoy the fruits of a few years of peace, if time were but given her to develop her resources, there is every reason to hope that she would be able at last to acquit herself of the heavy debt which she has incurred without profiting by it. For besides the advantages of position and fertility, Greece possesses great unexplored riches in her national lands, consisting of arable land, olive and mulberry trees, and vineyards, representing a value of several millions of drachmas, and which, if they were made over to the people at a low price paid annually, might in time realize a capital sufficient of itself to cover the interest of the foreign debt. If, therefore, it is neither the good of Greece nor the pecuniary interest of England that requires the line of policy followed by the latter, what is the cause of this violent conduct, this determined animosity which threatens to alienate from her all affection, to destroy her influence for ever, and to make the English name, formerly so loved and so respected in Greece, be vowed to almost equal execration with that of the Turks? What is the aim of these stormy despatches which excite to disobedience and excuse revolt, of the open support given to an opposition which raises its hand against the king, and evokes civil war? What is meant when the agents of England become the auxiliaries of the rebels, as at Patras and Vonitza, and the Ionian islands are their refuge and starting point? Do all these underhand dealings tend to overthrow Greece? We do not choose to admit even the possibility of such a supposition; but were it even possible to suppose that the plan is to give up Greece to the horrors of anarchy, in order to lay hold on the whole or a part of her territory, this political robbery would meet with enormous difficulties. To the north of Greece lie all those provinces inhabited also by Greeks, who await with impatience the propitious moment for their deliverance; and these provinces touch upon the Sclavonian provinces, which by their position and their population touch upon Russia: at the first shock, Greeks and Sclavonians would rise like one man; and if they saw hostile projects on the part of Great Britain, they would ask the help of Russia; and then the paternal impulse would not be easily quelled, even were the nation thus struggling not supported by the sympathy and the interest of other great powers. But supposing the plan is only to dethrone King Otho. Would they make Greece a republic? Greece republicanised would immediately turn towards France, in the same manner as the foreign policy of England has just thrown Spain and Italy into the arms of that power. But do they intend to give Greece another king? If he

is again chosen among the neutral courts, who can answer for his continuing the line of policy he might begin by adopting? If a change of dynasty takes place in Greece, it may be taken for granted that a Russian prince will reign next. It would therefore be a thousand times better for England to maintain the existing order of things, to support a king who, if he is not English, is at least not Russian, to alter her policy, and imitate the wisdom of France and Russia, try to influence King Otho by gentleness rather than by violence, at the risk of seeing Greece and her king fall into the hands of Russia, or Greece without her king into the hands of France.

ART. VI.—*Rest in the Church. By the Author of "From Oxford to Rome."* London: Longmans.

THIS book is rather remarkable, as suggestive of the nature of those spiritual temptations which some amongst us have had or still have to endure in their endeavours to realize the Catholic Faith of our Church, than notable for the originality of its ideas or any peculiar brilliancy of illustration. Regarded in a literary, and possibly even in a Catholic point of view, "From Oxford to Rome" was a more valuable contribution to the literature of the day. It had more of life and freshness; it appealed more sensibly to the reader's heart; and breathed, we almost feel inclined to add, a more loving and ardent appreciation of the highest mysteries of the faith. The authoress is one of those who has deserted our Anglican mother for the communion of Rome; but, unlike many who have been nurtured and bred within her fold and yet have turned against her, she is, or rather was, a daughter of Protestant dissent. We would hope and pray that this fact may lighten the load of her criminality; though we feel it impossible to conceal our conviction, that a melancholy absence of true self-discipline, a wilfulness that will on all occasions choose its own way, an ultra-protestantism (if we may so express ourselves) of mind and disposition, has led this lady so far astray, and is even yet the ruling principle of her faith and conduct.

Old is the saying, but not less old than true, that extremes meet. Careful observers must have noted that the same irreverent phraseology, the same careless handling of divine things, which is unhappily so characteristic of Protestant dissent, is also the wonted mark of practical Romanism. He, who doubts the fact, needs but to glance at any current number of the "Tablet" or "Dolman's Magazine," or to run his eyes over the first few chapters of the Roman Catholic "Father Clement," "Father Oswald," as it is called, "a Catholic Story,"—to arrive at an absolute and most painful conclusion on this subject. The truth is, that freedom, properly guarded and restrained, guided by the voice of Scripture and of universal tradition, duly subject therefore to Catholic authority, and, above all, hallowed and purified by the abiding presence of love and faith and holy reverence, *is* the wondrous gift of Providence, the talent for the use or abuse of which each man will have to answer to his Maker. This freedom, rightly understood, is the only condition of indi-

viduality, of mental or spiritual being worthy of the name, of life transcending the sphere of animal existence. Even to the very angels was this individual "Ego," involving the power to stand or fall, accorded. Freedom appears to be the very basis of creation. Without it, though evil indeed had not been possible, the worlds and their inhabitants could all have been mere brilliant shadows of their Creator's glory: a myriad lyres responding to the central harmony, but that, by the very law of their being, and therefore in a degree mechanically and passively; not with the full intellectual and spiritual assent of free but humble love. We see then that freedom may in one sense be regarded as the origin of ill, inasmuch as it must needs involve its possibility, and has induced its realization: but even thence must we conclude, how glorious and holy a thing this mighty principle must be, which, despite the myriad woes occasioned by it, was constituted the law of spiritual and mental life by the Everlasting Lord of glory. Freedom, then, has been granted to man: he was created in love, the image of his Maker. From that lofty height he has indeed fallen: he has abused his freedom for ill: he has raised his independent "Ego" in opposition to his God, instead of lovingly submitting it to His All-Wise decrees. And the result was sin and shame, and banishment from God's presence; nay, more, an utter incompetency to regain lost Paradise, an abiding self-idolatry, which must for ever separate from God and heaven, which is the very element of endless woe. And the Almighty would not, from His infinite self-consistency *could* not, recall his own creation, revoke the law of freedom, which was to be the eternal curse or blessing of humanity. He would not annihilate that human will which erected self for its god; which elected the evil, and abhorred the good, and which was therefore doomed to endless ages of hate-fraught freedom, of free despair. But the Almighty, to whom eternity is one boundless Now, the mystic Trinity in Unity, our Lord and God, had provided for us "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world," our adorable Saviour and Master, "the man Christ Jesus;" and through Him humanity has once more been exalted to freedom and communion with its Maker. This freedom is once more ours to employ: holy Baptism yields the grace which purifies and hallows it, and devotes it to God's service; and that grace is ever-present with the wills of those who love their Lord and Saviour; not irresistibly and absolutely controlling, but guiding, elevating, inspiring,—enabling man to offer the free-will worship of prayer and praise. This freedom the Roman Church refuses to recognise: she proclaims the necessity for absolute obedience to human authority; she assures us that in all religious questions,

whether of faith or discipline, the conscience and the intellect have virtually no voice. But what is the consequence of this? Free-will, the condition of our being, the law of our existence, cannot be altogether extirpated from man's nature. If it is not guided into the right channel, if it is denied its true development, it will seek some unlawful means of manifestation. Thus, whilst professing an absolute external submission to the will and authority of a brother sinner, we often find the Romanist the victim of a diseased self-will. He strains at what is opposed to the nature of humanity, he falls into that very error of irreverence which he has confounded with the lawful use of freedom. He obeys perhaps externally, but the spirit of obedience, of docile love, is wanting to him. He obeys, because he sees or imagines to see the absolute rule, "Do this, and thou shalt live!" He does not obey, because obedience is in itself a holy joy; for a relative obedience of this high nature cannot be opposed to true reason or conscience,—it must be the child of freedom.

We do not charge the authoress of "From Oxford to Rome" with this irreverence of heart, which yields an externally absolute and legal submission, and on that very account can yield no more; but we do recognise in her writings a painful development of self-conscious licence,—of religious recklessness, if such a term may be pardoned to us. Her first inquiry never seems to be, What is God's will, what my duty? But rather, (severe as the assertion may appear,) What is my *pleasure?* Will the communion of Rome yield me higher joys, more spiritual blessings, than that of the Church of England?—This, and this alone, seems to have been the ruling motive for her apostasy from that Church, which had baptized and blessed her with the presence of God the Holy Spirit,—which in the Catholic Eucharist had communicated to her fainting soul the glorious Lord of life. She knew and felt all this; deeply, fervently: so she plainly tells us. In her first work, "From Oxford to Rome," she has obviously portrayed herself in a female character, Ernestine, whose devotional transports on being brought within the visible Church of Christ, and rendered a recipient of her wondrous blessings, she has most beautifully and feelingly described. But an unfortunate tendency, also the child of self-will, to yield her conscience and intellect to the absolute direction and control of some one self-constituted individual guide, this, co-operating with her apparently laudable but truly most dangerous thirst for higher spiritual joys, for yet more mystic blessings, wherever they were to be obtained and at whatever price,—these things blinded her eyes to the plain directions of conscience; these virtually extinguished reason—that light of the mind, without which man is as a wandering bark

tossed by every tempest; these drove her across the boundary of right and duty and lawful obedience, and subjected her to the despotic supremacy of a Church, which, by her own confession, even then had neither fairly won her heart, nor secured the homage of her mind or soul. She went, because others went: because her earthly guide and teacher set her the example; because Rome dazzled her with the prospect of higher spiritual joys: above all, because she did not pause humbly to inquire, What is the will of my Lord and Saviour? what is my appointed duty?—not because her God called, but because she willed to go. No doubt, there was much of self-deception, of enthusiastic zeal; there almost always is in such cases: but we are not too severe in denouncing self-will as the origin of this and of many another fall. What are the motives generally assigned for change?—Ward's "Ideal" will supply the most practical reply; Newman's doctrine of Development is an apology for the learned, from the former "master in Israel," who knows that from Scripture and Catholic tradition he has again and again disproved these tenets which he has now thought proper to adopt: it has little influence on the general body, who are rather guided by the heart than head, who are attracted by the Roman ideal; and who, assuming that the Church should be already triumphant, weigh their spiritual mother in this ideal balance, and find her wanting, and then persuade themselves that communion with Rome will secure them from the spiritual temptations to which they have been exposed, will yield them external unity, and breathe peace to their souls. They call and long for peace, where no peace is: they will not fight the fight of faith: their reasons waver in the strife of infidelity and Christianity around them; and instead of going to the true fountain of assurance, their Lord and their God, seeking Him in humble prayer and the devout use of the appointed means of grace, they take refuge under the imaginary infallibility of Rome, presuming and really believing that they have thereby increased their own chances of salvation. But it is not in this spirit that the truly Catholic Christian will act: his first object will not be to secure his own personal salvation only, but to set forth the glory of God; not to seek the "closer walk" by devotional excitement, however intense, but in the performance of his bounden duty; not to make religious expediency, however fair-seeming, but loving and free obedience, the constant rule of life.

The authoress of "From Oxford to Rome" has sinned, in common with many a brother and sister, who now perhaps bitterly repent the past; she has deserted her appointed post, and, conscious of her sin, she has upraised her voice in these two works (for the second indirectly inculcates the same lesson) to

warn others against following her example. We have said, that her first book appealed more touchingly to the feelings: it was, in truth, in many respects very beautiful; occasionally too ornate and ambitious in style, and theologically unsatisfactory and self-contradictory to a most extraordinary extent, yet nevertheless imbued with a deep devotional spirit, and relating a most melancholy tale, which appealed to the sympathies of all. We saw therein portrayed the gradual declension of more than one child of God from Catholic faith to Romish error, and afterwards beheld their spiritual sorrows, in the gradually dawning sense of the great sin into which a craving for the luxuries of religion, and an absence of attention to the plain commands of duty and the will of God, had one by one seduced them. At the conclusion of the work we were left with the general impression, that, though unsound on many points, its authoress was, in point of faith, rather an Anglo-Catholic than a Romanist, save that the obedience of love was still wanting to her soul. She proclaimed, however, distinctly, that whilst she bitterly regretted the step she had taken in leaving the Anglican communion, she felt that a vow now bound her to the service of Rome, and that she could not break that vow without incurring the penalties of mortal sin. A strange position this, to which we shall recur anon.

It has been stated, that the work which now lies before us, "Rest in the Church," was written by way of penance for the expression of heterodoxy in "From Oxford to Rome;" for which, be it remarked, she had formally declared her penitent grief in the chief British organ of Romanism, the "Dublin Review." But we know not how to credit this statement, seeing that the same tone of mind manifests itself from the first page to the last of this volume; the same peculiar independence of any church,—the same resolute "nonconformity," as she herself expresses it,—the same uncatholic self-will. This is severe language; but we have already endeavoured to show, why, vindicating the lawful rights of the human conscience and intellect, we nevertheless feel it our duty to deal harshly with the spirit of disobedience and irreverence, wherever and howsoever displayed. This lady must know that the Church of Rome makes unconditional submission a pledge of her membership; yet she chooses to claim and hold this membership, accepting and rejecting just as much as she may think proper. How marvellous, and yet—may we not add?—how common is this inconsistency! Anglicans submit to Rome without submitting; preferring her communion, her discipline, her faith even; but without in the least realizing, or endeavouring to realize, their new duties. If they cannot absolutely accept the faith, and submit to the authority of Rome, what right have

they to join her? Either the cardinal doctrine of Rome, her infallibility, is a holy truth or a blasphemous mockery. If true, how vain, how sinful must be all opposition to it on the part of its vowed servants and slaves! if false, how wicked must be the self-willed external submission to it on the part of those who know that they are cutting themselves off from communion with their own spiritual mother, and virtually, as far as in them lies, excommunicating the Church of their Baptism, because she will not bow down before that infallible supremacy which they themselves reject, and which must be either the visible curse or blessing of the Church. Everywhere we perceive in the authoress of these works, as in so many others, a shrinking from first principles,—an unwillingness to follow out their own intellectual, spiritual, and moral conclusions: and this cowardice cloaks itself in the vesture of humility; this real infidelity conceals itself beneath the mantle of an external absolute assurance; the living faith of God transmutes itself into a legal submission to the Pope,—into what this authoress terms, "the demand for an *ultimate authority!*" And now let us pass as quickly as we well may through the records of this suggestive book,—records of holy aims and desires and intellectual errors, of devotional feeling and will-worship, of catholic love and sectarian practice. In the very preface we find a recognition, on the part of the authoress, of her own want, the spirit of true obedience, and the false remedy suggested, which she afterwards never appears to realize, of unconditional submission to external authority. What authority, she says not,—apparently, inquires not; believing, perhaps, all inquiry to be uncatholic. "Obedience," she says, "is the first commandment of the Church, the single law of peace." Obedience to God? Yes: this must be absolute. Obedience to God's Church? No: for unless that Church be infallible, obedience to her must be relative, limited by conscience, guarded by the love of God and by duty. But had the authoress believed the Church to be infallible, she could not have written this book. She urges us then practically to yield unlimited obedience to a power which may err. Here is the first manifest inconsistency. And here let us guard against misconception. We know, indeed, that the promise has been given; we are sure that it is fulfilled, and ever will be:—The gates of hell shall not prevail against the Church. The central verities of the Catholic faith, the holy mystery of the Trinity in unity, and the incarnation of our blessed Lord, have been borne witness to at all times and in all places by the visible Christian Church. That Church is built upon "this Rock," the Godhead of Christ our Lord, and she shall never be overthrown. But the Divine promise involved no

gift of infallibility, guaranteed no preservative against any possible error or heresy which should not impugn the very foundations of the faith. Finally, this is an age of probation, not of perfect bliss; of faith, not of absolute knowledge; of Catholic authority, approving itself alike to the conscience and the intellect, but not of infallibility.

The Introduction is long, and contains much that is remarkable. First, the revival of Anglicanism, in its higher sense, within the last twenty years, is dwelt on with love; but soon the presence of error reveals itself, and the cuckoo-cry for an ultimate earthly authority is again upraised, and styled "the great tenet of Catholicism," but apparently without any honest attempt to realize the meaning of the cry. Immediately afterwards, we are however informed, that the enemy of Catholicism is now—Intellect! the light divine, which separates man from the brute, who can also love and fear, nay, is not wholly devoid of moral instincts, while conscience and reason in their higher sense pertain to man alone below. We here see the attempt of human nature to justify the extinction of that light which it dares not to employ, because in so doing it would at once condemn itself. Philosophy, knowledge, and human intellect are declared not to be subsidiary, but naturally and unavoidably hostile, to faith, reliance, and the Catholic Church;—a fatal, but, in a Romanist, no unnatural error. True is it, that the wisdom of the pagan world was foolishness with God; that the humblest of Christian penitents was wiser than the heathen sage. True is it even now, that the intellect may be partially illumined, whilst the conscience is dead in "sins and trespasses;" true is it, that the conscience may be led to saving truth, whilst the intellect errs widely from the mark. Nevertheless, the moral and the intellectual powers in man, far from being necessarily opposed to one another, are naturally allied by the closest ties. Conscience may arrive at conclusions which altogether transcend the intellect and its perceptions, but not at such as are irreconcilable with them. Nay, in the ordinary course of life, intellect and conscience are inseparable; the mind is, no doubt, the vassal of the soul, but it is not its foe! Christianity approves itself not only to the conscience, but to the intellect as well.

Then, in evidence of this irresistible tendency on the part of intellect to oppose the truth, the authoress proceeds to class rationalism, eclectic philosophy, and Protestantism together, declaring most strangely of each of these, that it does not "refuse the heart" to Christianity, but would serve it with the free service of the mind. Confusion, almost inextricable confusion, is embodied in this assertion. By Protestantism, we

believe, we are to understand Protestant dissent; and if so, we say, rationalism, eclectic philosophy, and Protestant dissent, all reject and do despite to the spirit of reverential love, of course with very different degrees of criminality; and the intellect, severed from the influence of reverential love, deceives them. We doubt not, we say again and again, that freedom may be used to sin, and reason to unbelief; but the evil lies in the abuse, not in those powers which God has granted, and sanctified to his faithful children by the abiding presence of His grace. True it is, that earthly wisdom is most apt to stray from the path of God's commandments; that, when not illumined by His grace, it degenerates into intellectual pride, and arrives at false conclusions; but the very same mental powers, hallowed by the love of God, are called to the service of the faith, and may achieve intellectual trophies to the glory of His Church.

We point attention to a beautiful passage (p. 20) which the authoress would do well to take to heart herself as a warning against false asceticism, and pass rapidly to a "so-called word for Puseyism," where another great error is developed. But first let us caution the authoress, and all others in her condition, against the perusal of such works as Strauss's "Leben Jesu," and the writings of Cousin and Jouffroy, or even of Channing. Strauss's theory is not the dangerous foe to Christianity which it is here represented to be: it is simply absurd, and therefore scarcely worthy of deliberate refutation. Theorising Germans may listen with patience to the suggestion that the Gospels were a myth, believed in by those who invented them, without previous consultation, and drawing on their own fancies for the facts. The Anglo-Catholic feels that the only controversial reply to this should be conveyed in Archbishop Whately's famous Napoleon-pamphlet, which, had it proceeded from a German Kant or Hegel, might probably have found *believers* amongst our Teutonic brethren. We are sorry to seem scoffers, but we really know not how to treat this theory with seriousness or reverence. French philosophers, or pseudo-philosophers, are, no doubt, more dangerous foes; but, after all, of what moment are these aberrations of the human intellect to the loving Christian, whose intellect and conscience alike assure him that Christianity must be either a divine truth or a gigantic falsehood, and whose mind as well as soul, whose reason and feeling alike, reject the latter alternative as unworthy of a single moment's consideration? And yet we are to be told, that if we do not altogether abandon reason in religion, we must be infidels, and threatened with the awful wisdom of Strauss, and Cousin, and Jouffroy, and Emerson. For this, and this alone, is the real meaning of these

strange denunciations of intellect, as opposed to God's Church. Alas for the faith of the educated, which is based upon a mere sentiment, however glorious: and faith, altogether separate from, nay, hostile to, intellect, can be no more. We must not forget a word of censure for the presumptuous allusion to the works of our Church's intellectual heroes (p. 42), where even the great Butler is obviously marked out for the most uncharitable reprobation; and another for the unjustifiable severity on the writer's part towards the so-called Evangelical School in the English Church; and so we pass to this "word for Puseyism," where, amidst much that is really beautiful and true, we find the assertion that the Christian should "commit himself to the control of one *personal* authority, and gather his attention and affection round one centre, choose one esteemed judgment to be his appeal, rest himself in the direction of *one man*, and *trust* that he be not taken away from him, and it be said that he, like the king Jehoash, 'did right' but 'all the days of Jehoiada the priest.'" None will suspect us of wishing to weaken the tie betwixt the humble Christian and the appointed pastor of the flock: but here it is implied that by an act of lawless self-will we should annihilate our own just and lawful freedom, and *choose* one absolute individual lord, one infallible guide, and cling to him for weal or woe, for good or evil, through light and darkness. Here, if ever, may we well apply those solemn words, "call no man father!" Neither thy father in the flesh, nor thy spiritual counsellor, can be to thee more than a human, finite, fallible being. In the spirit of reverential love, but not of blind assurance, should the Christian *follow* his temporal or spiritual superiors; and, above all, should he guard against the erection of some one spiritual hero, as the infallible representative of his God. There is but One Man—reverentially do we say it—who can never fail us or deceive us,—the man Christ Jesus, Incarnate Deity. He is ever with his own to support, to cheer, to strengthen them: in all our afflictions is He afflicted, and "the angel of his presence" will preserve us.—But surely the uncatholic error, here denounced, has been condemned with sufficient distinctness by Holy Writ. Will men still say, "I am of Paul," and "I of Apollos," and "I of Cephas," and yield their reasons and consciences, those gifts for which they are responsible to their God, captive to the will of others—their fellow-creatures, who may perchance prove even more blind than they? Shall the children of God's Church emulate the creature-worship of the Pantheist? Shall we thus blindly obey a fellow-sinner, nay, follow him from the very Church of our baptism to schism and heresy and spiritual death? Shall we forget the apostolic command, which must imply our right and

duty to distinguish truth from falsehood, good from evil, "If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed!"—ay, if he were "an angel from heaven." And the unhappy Oakeley was it who gave this advice, that all should trust themselves to "some living teacher or model of sanctity, who may *seem* especially commended to *our confidence!*" "If the blind lead the blind, shall not both fall into the ditch?" But what a melancholy absence of living faith, what spiritual isolation, what ignorance of the Lord of life, what exile from God the Holy Spirit, does this terrible teaching imply, of the absolute necessity for some one lord and ruler of our faith! Alas, how much secret infidelity must be inextricably interwoven with the seeming devotional fervour of this unhappy school! And yet, let us not be misunderstood: we deny not that intellectual and spiritual leaders must be expected and even desired within the Church of Christ, as elsewhere: we only denounce blind confidence, absolute reliance; we only maintain that the humblest Christian has his own soul to save, and his own conscience to obey, and can answer for himself only to his God.

We pass to the body of the work before us, which is a tale, mainly concerning the fortunes of an English young lady of rank, who adopts what are popularly called "Tractarian" views, and then finds that she cannot reconcile these with the use of this world, and so eventually takes refuge in Romanism: possibly, a by no means uncommon case amongst the recent perverts from our Catholic communion. The tale opens with the relation of an incident which may well serve as a warning to many of our wealthier clergy, and laymen also, and proceeds in one of its most interesting passages to describe the nature and portray the lives of the parents of Emil Norman, a clergyman, and one of the principal characters in the book. We are not, however, enabled to pause, as we might wish, over this and many similar manifestations of Christian love. Lady Helen and her mistaken asceticism present a more important subject for comment, and to this we hasten to direct our readers' attention. The sentiments which are supposed to animate her are forcibly expressed by Mr. Faber, in one of his early Anglican compositions, quoted by our authoress, where we read, "Why are we clinging to these perishable things? Surely we do not love them. Our home is not here; it is very far away." And again: "You cannot love the world, nor the world you. The Cross has been planted in your hearts. *You and the world*, *you and your affections*, you and your idols, *must part for ever*, part in the blood that flowed where the stern Cross went deepest in. You and your dreams must part, O ye of the Christian circumcision!" We well know how attractive

such language must appear to the devotionally ardent: we know also that there *is* a sense in which these words are literally true; in which we must hate "father and mother, and wife and children," for His sake. We are aware of the difficulties which beset this great question, and feel that it is not here that we could enter deliberately upon the consideration of them, and endeavour to dispose of so solemn and momentous an inquiry. In the attempt every paragraph might extend into a chapter, and our essay to a volume.

To return, however, to the rule of spiritual mortification; we feel bound to express our conviction, that whilst "out of Christ" we must indeed hate the world and the world's gifts, "in Christ" this very world is hallowed to the true believer. We know that nothing earthly, however great, however beautiful, coronet or crown, honour or glory, friendship or love, is vain, *if* it be hallowed by the presence of our Lord and Saviour. We believe, that "in Christ all things are pure" to the pure of heart. We believe that "true religion and undefiled" is to be sought and found in the use of this world, and not in the neglect and abhorrence of it. We are sure "that we and our affections" must *not* part, because we love Christ: no, they will be hallowed, deepened, glorified, in His love. Even the beautiful in art and in nature is not to be despised. If our first duty is to love God, our second is to love our neighbour; and the twain are inseparable. We have seen the world almost orphaned of practical Christianity, in the fourth and fifth centuries, previous to the triumph of barbarism and temporary darkness, when the just and holy fled to the caves and the mountains, and abandoned active communion with their living men. We have seen false asceticism corrupt the faith, lower the standard of practical morality, trample on the arts, uproot civilization, heathenize society, and draw the curtain of the dense night of ignorance and superstition over the broad world of Christianity. And therefore do we fear, and fear with reason, that this destructive power may again lead "the lambs of the flock" astray; may again deprive society of the hallowing influence of their presence; may again force Christianity into direct hostility with all the good and gracious gifts of our Merciful Creator and Redeemer. The authoress of "Rest in the Church" has, to some extent, and in some passages, supplied satisfactory replies herself to this pernicious theory. Nevertheless she thinks that "deep hearts will respond" to Lady Helen's complaints, when she tells her clergyman that she would wish to shun communion with the world, *because* she finds constant trials to her faith and temper in that communion; as if this were not

the very reason for which she should continue to fight the good fight, and war against the evil world, the flesh, and the devil, without abandoning her primary duties. Self-denial should be indeed unceasing, and at the Church's appointed seasons should be manifested externally in fasting and prayer: but here, as ever, the wish to convert relative into unlimited duties, to pass the boundaries and exceed the conditions of humanity, to be taken out of the world instead of abiding in the Spirit, *to attain the absolute*, must lead astray, must conduce to error, and ultimately, if persisted in, to sin. Surely "the Son of man came eating and drinking:" shall we err, if we follow in His footsteps? He converted water into wine; He blessed a marriage-festival with His presence,—at which, we may be well assured, He did *not* separate the bridegroom from the bride; He even yielded his indirect approval to "music and dancing," by making them the symbols of holy joy in the parable of "the Prodigal Son." Shall we be told that He, being absolutely and infinitely holy, could use that world, which we sinners must fly from? We answer, "His grace is sufficient for us." If we abide in Him, the evil world shall not prevail against us. But let us not think of ourselves alone and our own immediate dangers. Shall we forget His Cause? shall we desert our brethren? Let us take heed to ourselves, remembering St. Paul's dread prediction concerning the latter times, "when some should forbid to marry," and otherwise command to abstain from the lawful use of this world. And let us remember, too, that Rome, though she permits this use, declares it to be inconsistent with the highest degree of earthly holiness, whilst Scripture, on the contrary, proclaims to all, and not to a class, "Be ye holy, as your Father which is in heaven is holy;" and yet declares "every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused if it be received with thanksgiving." Here, as ever, *the spirit* of Christianity is to be sought: self-denial, obedience, confidence, must all be relative duties, all subject to faith and charity, to the abiding love of God and man.

And now we feel that we have but faintly and hastily shadowed forth what appears to us the Catholic rule on this most solemn subject of inquiry. We may return to the subject ere long. Meantime we entreat the authoress of this work, and all those who think with her that the very use of this world is of sin, is denied to the baptized Christian who aspires to a high degree of holiness, to consult the light of that conscience and that intellect which God has placed within them; to pray that grace may be given them to think more of others and less of themselves; to endeavour to carry religion into the world, and not to regard

the twain as *necessarily* hostile; to believe, that in a sense, and to a certain degree, within Christendom, and more particularly in this our land, "the kingdoms of this world are" already "the kingdoms of the Lord and his Christ." No doubt, this is a period of trial and imperfection: the full manifestation of glory is not yet ours; the millennial reign is to come. Nevertheless, for each one of us individually may this earthly life be already hallowed through Christ.

We cannot pause for more than a passing allusion to the strange selection of Thomas à Kempis' *Imitation* as the *only* book for a Christian's study, the sacred Scriptures being apparently altogether disregarded; or to the too absolute commendations of religious reserve, partly extracted from Mr. Faber's writings, in Emil Norman's letter; or to the presumptuous condemnation of the old High-Church (p. 154); or to the apparently almost malignant comments on evangelical tendencies towards true Catholicism (pp. 156, 157); or to other errors, all suggestive of overweening self-confidence and diseased self-will. Later, we find it laid down, that the most innocent enjoyments of society are "*in themselves*, and *apart from circumstances*, unquestionably wrong and sinful," and only to be borne as a means of spiritual martyrdom. In themselves, on the contrary, these things are good, and in Christ they may be holy: that is, rank, authority, ay, even wealth and splendour, are ordinances of God's visible creation, which *may* be used to His glory. Our hearts may carry evil into all these things, and therefore do we need constant prayer and abiding faith and love in the use of them; but we are not justified in passing our condemnation on them, in rejecting them as accursed. As our authoress makes one of her chief personages say, though she obviously has not taken these words to heart, and seems to have forgotten them in the next page: "True perfection does not consist precisely in this or that mortification, but in the exact performance of prescribed duties. Whatever is contrary to this, though it may be very good and laudable in itself, would not be a virtue to us." This truth is clouded by subsequent assumptions of the possibility of human *merit*, and of the duty of *absolute* obedience to superiors; nevertheless, if our duty to God be indeed the primary object of our concern, we shall not be easily able to persuade ourselves that He has no work for us in "the world."

We have much more on the terrible inconsistency manifested in the enjoyment of *any* mere earthly joy by one who is seeking close communion with her God. We will not however say more upon this subject. Further on, we are told that many Christians in the Church of England sigh vainly for absolution, which they

cannot obtain. What? Do they never enter God's house? Or is their faith so weak that they cannot appropriate the authoritative words of God's minister to themselves, unless they are privately applied to them? Is it then the private approval of the individual priest which is the most essential element in the Church's absolution? Here, again, in this call for personal and private absolution, as indispensable to the soul, we cannot but recognize the absence of true and living faith.—Surely the authoress of "Rest in the Church" must know that the Church's public absolution conveys cleansing grace to every repentant sinner.—We recur once more, despite our previous resolution, to the subject of ascetic retirement, because we find a passage (p. 228) which expresses most beautifully the truth we have endeavoured to set forth, that our higher duty is to serve the world, and not to leave it. "If we had no higher motive to holiness and good works than our own salvation, we might follow the anchorite to his cell, and wear away these sinful bodies in perpetual penitence and suffering; but we *have* a higher, infinitely higher, truer, nobler motive—in the love of GOD! and that love bids us abide with our brother, and sympathize and labour with him, and help him when we are the stronger, and pray for him when he falls, as we desire also that he will do for us; *we* are to add to godliness brotherly kindness." This is most correct and beautiful: but an eulogium of the ancient hermits follows, and the result remains, that the heroine ends her days in a convent. The truth is, that our authoress's reason is at variance, on this, as so many other subjects, with that ultimate authority to which she wishes to tender absolute obedience; and so she is also at variance with herself. We pray that light may yet be granted her to choose "the better way," devoting herself, with Mary, if she so will, rather to the life of contemplation than of action, but not absolutely abiding in either exclusively; remembering that even Mary lived in the world, and retained those earthly affections which false asceticism would bid us shun as contrary to the cross, and which nevertheless drew tears from the eyes of our adorable Lord and Master.

And now we must pass rapidly over many pages; the somewhat confused political theories, the relation of Ursula Norman's early life and love, and the portrayal of Ximene, the Roman Catholic, and her pious father-confessor, to whom she yields such seeming worship. We note the striking defence of the Roman Catholic service (p. 278), which must fail however in convincing the Anglo-Catholic, who has ever realized his Church's joys, that the vicarious intercession of the priest, and comparative independence of the individual worshipper in the Roman mass, yield any compensation for the loss of our full and visible communion of praise and prayer.

We feel that, though perhaps broadly and harshly stated, there is but too much truth in the lines:—

"And Rome,—though lights may burn and chants may soar,—
Can Catholic communion ne'er afford:
Each prays his prayers, each counts his rosary o'er,
A lawless commonwealth without a lord."

Whilst every true Anglican can bear the practical testimony of experience to the truth of this description:—

"With us, the holy priest, his people's guide,
Leads the deep wail of penitence for sin;
Whilst voices blend in outward praise allied,
Celestial communings are felt within.

"Nor in that temple only where we kneel,
Respond a thousand echoes to our lay;
The self-same tones bespeak a nation's zeal,
And myriads in communion praise and pray.

"O holy boon! O glorious bond of love!
Thou, Church of England, thus in concord sweet,
Thy prayers, like flowers, in one green wreath hast wove,
And lay'st them smiling at thy Master's feet."

And well may the humble Christian finally exclaim:—

"How was I worthy found thy child to be?
To aid such prayers, to swell such chants divine?—
O teach me all my helplessness to see,
And be thy Catholic communion mine!"

And all this can be deserted for Rome?—O fearful wonder!—But we hurry on. At page 327, Ximene is introduced, as singing a hymn to the Virgin; and the question is appended, "Who shall chide it; for it is beautiful and pious, and does no dishonour to Him who though Mary's son is Mary's Lord, and will be as assuredly her judge as ours?" This hymn styles the Virgin-Mother, "queen of heaven," "guide of the wanderer here below," and adjures her to "remind her Son" that He has died for us. Does not all this imply an absence of living faith in His *immediate* presence with His own?—But surely the authoress of this work must know, that the greater or less force of the epithets applied to the ever-blessed Virgin is but of little moment, in comparison with the momentous question whether every prayer to the creature, though it of course implies and recognizes the supremacy of God the Holy Trinity, is not, in its very essence, idolatrous, and therefore "of evil." Even prayer to the guardian angel who may be near us, and whom we might not unnaturally conjure to waft our

petitions to the skies, is strictly forbidden, since worship with *dulia* or *hyperdulia* is due to God alone. How much more indefensible must be direct addresses to those who unite in prayer with us from Paradise, but who, being neither omnipresent nor omniscient, are equally unable to read our hearts or hear our petitions! Scripture assures us, that prayer to the creature is idolatrous; though those who err in love shall be forgiven. And here we may be permitted to refer to some unhappy expressions in Keble's otherwise beautiful and holy "Lyra Innocentium;" the strains of which yield only after repeated hearings the full measures of their harmony, like modest flowers which must be closely pressed, ere they exhale the sweetness that resides within them. We allude to expressions which appear to imply the immediate presence of the Virgin with living Christians. In a little poem entitled "Orphanhood," a childish mourner's thoughts are directed, as it appears to us with no little daring, to the recognition of One beyond and above her own interceding parent,

"A holier Mother, rapt in more prevailing prayer."

We question greatly, whether distinctions of this nature are advisable or truly Catholic. We know indeed that the blessed Virgin, with all the departed company of the righteous, prays for the Church on earth, and therefore for its members; but in directing our attention *individually* to her and her prayers, we surely seek to be wise above what is revealed; nor is such direction to be excused on the mere score of devotional instinct, for this may often lead astray. Surely in the case of this orphan, her heart should have rested on the memory, should have aspired only to the presence, of "the Man of sorrows and acquainted with grief," the Lord Christ Jesus, Who said, "Suffer little children to come unto ME!" Who in the infinity of His Godhead has yet a tender brother's love for every mourner. But more especially must we object to the assertion that the Virgin is even now with the faithful when they pray, whether in their own homes or in the house of God[1]. Mr. Keble may mean, nay, *can* mean only that she is there in memory; that her chaste influence is ever with the faithful. But the employ of such dubious expressions on such a subject and in such a time should surely be lamented. —Again we read, in a passage descriptive of the Church's services:—

"CHRIST, with His Mother dear,
And all His Saints, is here!"

Surely, in such different senses present, as not to be capable of

[1] See page 63.

juxta-position so immediate. Our blessed Lord is with His Church in very deed, is actually present, not only as omnipresent God, but also as the risen Lord of life. But even if His saints can *ever* be capable of such communion as to be wherever He is, (which is perhaps Mr. Keble's idea, but which we hold impossible, inasmuch as the creature can never be more than an almost viewless speck in the Creator's glory,) of *this* we are well assured, that until the judgment-day all those departed in the love and faith of God must wait beneath the mystic altar, and are not perfected, not brought into the closest and highest possible communion with the Holy Trinity. And, knowing this, we surely should not use such language as would appear to imply the direct contrary, and partially to excuse what our Church recognizes as idolatry.

To return to the work before us; we cannot but reprobate the spirit in which the supposed model-clergyman in this tale is made to act, when his faith, his confidence, and his patience are put to the test. "Charity," we are told, "suffereth long and is kind; beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things." What shall we say, then, to Emil Norman, who not only refuses to yield some minor points of practice at the command of his bishop, but, throwing up his duties in disgust, retires to private life, because "*he is led to believe*"—led, that is, by his individual perceptions—that these practices, of which his bishop disapproves, are according to the will of his Church? No bishop, we know, would object to daily services, or weekly or still more frequent communions, or even to the practice of private confession, when not invariably accompanied by private absolution. But for the sake of some few externals, on the propriety or advisability of which his bishop may differ from him, a priest, it appears, is justified in abandoning his primary duties, in breaking his vow of lawful obedience, in retiring from the service of his Lord and Master! Surely there is much of *evil temper* here, much of unmortified self-will, which must be far more displeasing to Him who set us the example of never-tiring patience and love, than the harmless enjoyment of this world's goods. The natural result of this uncatholic and self-willed disobedience on the part of Emil Norman, is secession in a short time to the Roman Church. Not content with choosing to regard these externals as essentials, against the will of his bishop, Norman further chooses to take that individual bishop for a representative of the whole Anglican Church. Rome rises before him with her ideal infallibility, and he thinks, with many another half-sectarian, that he has but once to prostrate intellect and conscience in the dust, and then the struggle will be over, and all well; and so he falls.

He had before displayed, we may remark, the same impatience of control, the same fiery indignation and uncatholic heat of temper, when removed from one curacy to another by his rector, in order to promote tranquillity in the parish. Let those who find themselves in Emil Norman's position, remember that these checks *must* form the trials of their faith and love; that their Church does not *profess* to yield a practical *ideal*, which must not now be sought for on earth; that this is an age of probation, and not of perfect peace. We must not omit to stamp with our censure the presumptuous conduct of the same Emil Norman, in bidding Lady Helen know, that when a certain token from him reached her, she should be authorized to practise what he still considered idolatry, or creature-worship, and consequently conform to the Church of Rome. We here see the practical effects of that reliance on some one individual teaching, which was before recommended as essential to the Anglican Christian's peace of mind. At the conclusion of this work, the authoress informs us that she still professes "a humble but unretracted nonconformity;" first, as to the dogma that the Roman is exclusively the Catholic Church; and, secondly, as to the justifiability of making those Roman doctrines articles of faith which are not clearly to be traced in Holy Writ,—a position illustrated by references to inferior intercession, or prayers to the Virgin and saints, and to indulgences. Finally, the authoress adds, that whilst she exhorts none to submit to Rome, nay, would rather dissuade them from so terrible a step, she feels, that once taken, it can never be recalled, without bringing the crime of apostasy on the soul. This feeling she had strongly expressed in her previous work, grounding it there apparently on the solemn and binding nature of the vow which she had taken on herself advisedly, to remain Rome's child and vassal for ever. Now, with regard to any engagement of this nature, we surely need not undertake to prove that the baptismal vow of life-long allegiance to our spiritual mother can never be cancelled, but is binding to the last hour of life on the conscience of each and all; and that no act of schism, or heresy, proceeding whether from an intellectual or spiritual source of error, can in the slightest degree invalidate our obligation to resume our rightful position with the utmost possible celerity, and renew our humble tenure of service[2]. But we

[2] It is just possible, though highly improbable, that this lady, the authoress of "Rest in the Church," having been born and educated as a Dissenter, may not have received the gift of baptism after her conversion to the Catholic faith of the Church of England. If so, some reason for her otherwise inexplicable conduct might be discovered. Though even in that case no formal vow could bind her conscience to sin; and schism, and heresy, and allegiance to an usurped authority, may surely come within the catalogue of sins.

may go further than this. All *legal* vows are now "dead letters." Our promises in baptism, marriage, and ordination, are solemn engagements to perform our bounden duty: if no vow had been tendered, had the priest of God merely laid his hands upon us, and pronounced the operative words in either of these cases—"I baptize thee," "Whom God hath joined together," "Receive the Holy Ghost," our obligations would be virtually the same. Vows, which go beyond this, appear hard to reconcile with our Lord's distinct prohibition: "Ye have heard that it hath been said by them of old time, Thou shalt not forswear thyself, but shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths: but I say unto you, Swear not at all." Surely it would be monstrous to affirm, that a vow to commit sin is binding on the Christian. The only question for the Anglican then, who has deserted his communion for that of Rome, must be, Is allegiance to Rome sinful in me, or no? If it be so, if duty command, if conscience urge return to the old paths, wondrous indeed must be the self-delusion, which can imagine the soul for ever fettered by one rash act of folly. But we cannot believe that this dread of breaking a vow, which could not repeal a preceding vow far more holy and more binding, and irreconcilably opposed to the subsequent engagement, is the real motive for this lady's continued refusal to return to her true allegiance. We rather imagine that she still believes herself the recipient of certain gifts and graces in the Roman communion, which she would not obtain in the Anglican, and unfortunately prefers what she may consider religious expediency to the plain course of religious duty, and humble obedience to her God.

We scruple not to avow that Rome may boast some attractions which the Church of England does not offer; and first and foremost of these stands, undoubtedly, the daily celebration of the Eucharist. Surely this must be restored to us ere long. Many of the clergy, who live in populous districts, whether in London or elsewhere, have even now to partake of the Holy Sacrament daily; sometimes twice or thrice a day: no objection, therefore, could arise on the score of unpreparedness on their part for such constant communion. In our cathedrals, where a large body of clergy officiate, not the slightest real difficulty could present itself; and surely we need not demonstrate what a sanctity, what a glory, the daily celebration of the blessed Eucharist would yield to all the other rites and services of the Church.

We know, too, that unity is not sufficiently realized among us, nor can we profess to deny that the world, in its evil sense, exercises too much influence over our spiritual mother. But what of all this? The sun is not less the sun, because there are spots

upon his disk. The Church is not less the Church, because she is not yet perfect. The tares and wheat must grow together unto the harvest. How much better is it to stand in the old ways, and to wait the time of the Lord, than to cry out with impatient infidelity for a yet impossible ideal, and roam in search of it from the communion of our baptism. Nay, rather let us say; and pray to God to confirm our good resolve:—

> "Tarry, my soul, the Lord's own hour!
> Be firm, and He shall give thee power.
> The Lord shall cause thy woes to cease;
> Tarry His hour, my soul, in peace!"

Catholic in spirit as in doctrine, the Church of England offers a sure refuge to every humble-minded Christian, who would perform his duty in that station to which Almighty God has called him. Lawful authority, not absolute despotism; filial obedience, not slavery; constant self-denial, not self-torture,—are the landmarks of her sway. We have seen in the course of this article, that a secret infidelity, involving a consequent distrust of the light of conscience and intellect which God has placed within us, by which to shape our course, is the main source of the demand for an ultimate earthly authority—an individual and infallible judge. The confusion of the relative with the absolute, or the habit of grasping each truth or duty in turn exclusively, so as to blind for the moment to all other truths or duties, is another great source of error: men seem to think that the rule of the earthly father, the monarch, or the priest of Christ, must be absolute and unlimited, or can be no rule at all. Further, men look for the realization of the millennial promises to the Church in this probationary era, and so are naturally led to fix their eyes and hearts on that Roman Church, which professes to be already in possession of these blessings, and by that very profession only seals her own condemnation. Finally, men call for "peace," for "rest in the Church," and imagine that they shall find this in a professedly infallible communion. Alas! this is not the season of peace. The powers of good and ill are conflicting. Hell is marshalling its forces for a final desperate onset on the Church of God. The battle which is fought in the external world must be renewed more or less fiercely in every individual heart. Flight will not avail us. Should we seek the caves of the desert, doubt and dismay will overtake us there. We cannot escape from our responsibilities; from the awful duty of Choice.

ART. VII.—*History of the Fall of the Jesuits in the Eighteenth Century. By Count* ALEXIS DE SAINT-PRIEST, *Peer of France. Translated from the French.* London: Murray. 1845.

IF there is one subject more than another which requires to be approached, both by writers and by readers, in a calm, humble, forgiving, discriminating spirit, it is the system of Jesuitism. A few years since, and it might have been discussed as a geologist would examine the anatomy of some exhumed relic of the deluge. It seemed a by-gone fact in history—a phenomenon which we could now coolly and impartially scrutinize, relieved from the panic, and oppression, and distorted imagination, which had been roused by its presence. To speak of it as arising from its grave, and walking bodily among us, was to prophesy the resuscitation of the mammoth. And they who thought that they detected faint traces and suspicions of its workings in the heart of the British empire were called maniacs.

At the present day this cannot be. We have learnt from the mere spectacle of France and Switzerland, that Jesuitism is alive. Of its workings within ourselves we are indeed less conscious. But that it is among us, full of activity, full of hope, and extending its arms on every side, there is no longer any doubt. The fact is acknowledged by Rome herself[1]; and the temper with which it is too generally regarded is full of matter for anxious forebodings, and requires to be treated with the greatest caution.

On one side is the ardent, enthusiastic, and often indiscriminating animosity to every thing connected with Popery, which is tempted to attack truth from confounding it with error; which strengthens the adversary's position by assaults that cannot be maintained; which alienates the friends of truth by an apparent want of candour and equity, and creates sympathy for the accused by the injustice or violence of the accusation. On the other, is that newly-aroused spirit, which has been driven, chiefly in this way, to look with kindness and favour upon the whole system of Romanism; which, rather than see the Church distracted by dissent, would sacrifice even its liberty to the so-called unity of the Romish supremacy—which would take refuge from doubt and infidelity in Rome's pretension to infallibility—which sighs for

[1] See Bishop of Winchester's Charge, 1845, Appendix.

emancipation from the control of a civil power afraid to maintain either a creed or a church—which finds relief in the sensuism of Rome from the dryness and poverty and coldness of a system that endeavoured to spiritualize the soul of man into complete independence on his body. Any one who has observed the tone and language in which minds imbued with this spirit have expressed themselves, will have perceived that, instead of shrinking from the extreme developments of Romish peculiarities, as the wisest and best Romanists have done before, they have adopted them without the least hesitation. At one leap they have plunged into the bottom of the gulph. They have surpassed, as new converts often surpass, even the extravagances of their teachers. They have become Romanis Romaniores. And one of the chief points attracting their admiration has been the working of Jesuitism. System, we had written, but the system is the precise thing of which little seems to have been studied. And yet this is the one thing to be examined.

In the midst of all the misery and bitterness which our most righteous struggles with Rome have engendered, there has been one thought to which the mind could return from every conflict, and repose on it with peace, and soothe down by it every feeling at enmity with Christian love. Systems are not individuals, and individuals are not their systems. However the members of a vast machine must be affected by its organization, and the organization may be affected by its members, in our moral judgment they must be kept distinct. With whatever repugnance and dread we may regard the system of Jesuitism, Jesuits may live in holiness and die like martyrs. It is the perfection of a false system to entangle in it, and subdue to its service, good and elevated minds. Without them it can neither subsist, nor work. Once involved in it they can rarely be extricated. And the exaggeration of some great virtue, faith, or zeal, or obedience, or humility, may make them the unconscious ministers to enormous evil. The viciousness of the system cannot always prove their own vice; and their own virtue cannot always prove the virtue of the system. How far either is compromised by the other, it is not necessary to define; but a Christian mind looking at the faults of man will never forget the circumstances which may extenuate them in the sight of God; nor overlook the seeds of good, though unguarded and unbalanced they have sprung up into a harvest of crime.

Two great—two of the greatest—virtues of the Christian, lie at the root of Jesuitism, and impregnate all its workings—zeal on the part of the rulers, and obedience on the part of the ruled. That each should be directed to a wrong object, that they should thus become the parents of mischief and guilt, is not to be charged

even upon the authors of the system, without bearing in mind the age in which they lived, and the habits in which they had been trained. Jesuitism was not a new, self-invented scheme. It was the natural development of Romanism; and only an improvement and enlargement upon errors and institutions, which under the sanction of Romanism had become established as articles of faith, and as essential organs of the Church. Like Romanism itself, it laid its foundation professedly on true principles and right affections. Hence its energy, its extent of range, its empire over the heart, its duration, and its fascination. Unity in the Church, certainty in the faith, submission to the will of Heaven, self-sacrifice, zeal for the glory of God, corporate and social efforts for the good of mankind, above all, obedience to our appointed rulers—these, the watchwords of Jesuitism as of Romanism, most of all in an age of distraction, doubt, self-indulgence, and disorganization, must strike upon the better strings in the human heart; must rouse hopes and energies far higher than any system from which they are professedly excluded; must generate heroic exertions; must produce gigantic results; must tend to raise up amidst the ruins of society, almost pulverized as it is to atoms, vast and enduring monuments to fascinate the imagination and overawe the reason. His must be a cold and almost malignant heart who can view without sympathy and admiration the energy and endurance of Ignatius, the missionary labours of Xavier and his followers, the deep policy and wonderful knowledge of the human heart displayed in the formation and government of the society through all its phases, its unwearied, undespairing struggles against its foes, or the prodigious works of learning which it drew from the devotion of its followers.

If we cannot recognize, and even sympathize with this good in Jesuitism, we cannot be fit judges of its evil. But if the good blinds us to the evil, if we think it impossible that professed and zealous ministers of a cause, which they declare to be the cause of the Gospel,—men bearing the name of their Divine Master as their peculiar badge,—may still be delivering Him to His enemies, and betraying Him with a kiss,—if we thus despise all the prophecies given to us, that when Satan would tempt us most, He will appear as an angel of light, and that the deadliest enemies of the Church will be those of the same house, and who walked in it as friends—above all, if we will not examine before we judge, nor listen as patiently to the warnings of accusers as to the apologies of the accused, we cannot be innocent. And what hope have we of escaping from the punishment naturally denounced on such wilfulness, the being delivered over to a "strong delusion that we should believe a lie?"

And in the case of Jesuitism there is not even the excuse that witnesses are equally balanced, that facts are difficult to substantiate, and that common charity therefore demands that we should give the benefit of the doubt to the accused.

The chief fact to be substantiated, and on which the whole argument should primarily rest, need not be any collection of historical charges open to cavil, and on which certainty may be difficult, but the avowed, published, undisputed constitution of the society itself. And this is to be tried not by any calculations of human expediency, but by those acknowledged laws and standards which have been established by God Himself. Neither need it be judged by its actual results, but by its essential and necessary tendencies,—just as we pronounce upon the merits of any other association for political or for religious purposes,—as the State refuses to tolerate the Orange societies of Ireland,—as it examines the statutes of a college before it concedes a charter,—as the Church would repudiate the Evangelical Alliance or the Home Mission, prior to any experience of their operation for evil, and even after experience of their partial operation for good. The system of Jesuitism is an engine constructed for a particular purpose, and with most profound and marvellous skill. Is the purpose itself identical or compatible with the function and object of the Church or of the State; or is it one essentially erroneous, and which must tempt the human mind to extravagances and to crimes? Can its organization (an organization invented by man) be prevented from clashing with and destroying other organizations created by God? These are the questions to be asked by one who in sobriety and equity would determine on the question of its toleration.

Subsequently, indeed, may be brought in as illustrative of its probable working, and as confirmatory of reasonings from anticipation, that vast and extraordinary mass of historical depositions against it, every one of which singly may be disputed, or denied, or invalidated to an uninformed reader, by charges of falsified documents, or by the adducement of counter-statements; just as an ingenious logic has disputed the existence of Napoleon, or as all the accumulated evidences of Christianity may be plucked away hair by hair, till the whole have vanished from our grasp,—but which as a totality, if it be not founded on truth, presents a phenomenon inexplicable and without parallel, of perjury, of delusion, of blindness, of malignity and jealousy, of cruelty and blasphemy, wrapping in one thick cloud whole communities, successive generations, minds of the purest holiness and acutest discernment, sovereigns of all countries, churchmen and statesmen alike, Romanists as well as Protestants, those most akin and

congenial, as well as those most naturally alienated, and bearing them all on in one blind attempt to destroy innocence, and piety, and Christian zeal in the service of God by calumny and oppression. Testimonies have indeed been offered to the virtues of individuals within the system of Jesuitism,—to good which has been done by it,—to the spirit of zeal and self-abandonment which pervades its institutions, and to the excellency of objects proposed by it. Never let these be suppressed, or refused their just authority. But none of these touch the point disputed. No system, however evil, can be founded except on professions of truth, or be carried on for any time except by the ministration of good men; and the more powerful its instrumentality for evil, the greater must be its admixture of good. But that which is to be overbalanced and cleared away is the testimony to its evil. Rejected at first by Rome itself even in the extremity of its difficulties—protested against by its holiest ecclesiastics—kept at bay by the great body of the clergy of France—admitted at last only on sufferance, and on a renunciation of its essential laws,—censured again and again by Rome herself, to whose service it was exclusively pledged,—the subject of perpetual complaints and remonstrances from foreign missions,—contended against even to death by Pascal and the Port Royal,—solemnly examined and condemned by repeated parliaments of France,—embroiled with almost every university in which it obtained a footing,—expelled successively from country after country which had opened its arms to receive it,—charged again and again with treason, and rebellion, and regicide, not at one period, or by one monarch, or in one country, or by Protestants only, or vaguely and calumniously, but again and again, by Portugal as by England, by Henry IV. as by Elizabeth, after solemn judicial trials in the face of the whole world —next (what to a member of the English Church must have its weight) singled out by the whole body of its most catholic teachers, by the men most discriminating in their condemnation of popery, as its most dangerous supporters, and the most pernicious enemies of the Gospel, as even the strongest embodiment of Antichrist itself—and finally crushed and suppressed by a pope himself: with all these grave suspicions (to use the mildest language) resting upon its character, Jesuitism claims to be welcomed among us. Which minds, where the safety of souls is at stake, will exercise most Christian charity, united with most Christian prudence—those who look on it with alarm and repugnance, or those who without proof or inquiry pronounce upon its injured innocence, and in their dread of liberalism and Erastianism throw themselves into the arms of Jesuitism?

But on these latter evidences of its nature we do not intend to

rest. Grant it true (though of the facts there is no proof) that the opposition of the parliament of Paris was dictated by hatred of Rome, when it was siding with the Romish clergy of France,—that the *Comptes Rendus* were drawn up by enemies to religion, when they exhibit the greatest reverence for other religious orders,—that the condemnation of the Jesuits' morals was pronounced upon falsified extracts, though they were publicly produced and verified,—that the Port Royal was instigated by heretical tendencies, and the universities by jealousy,—that all the charges of treason and rebellion were maintained by subornation of perjury,—and that neither in France, nor in England, nor in Portugal, nor in Spain, could the truth be discovered or prevail,—that Paraguay was a realized Utopia, not a commercial empire created and defended in defiance of the rights of its lawful sovereign,—that the society was not responsible for the erroneous teaching of its members, though no body ever more solemnly pledged itself to uniformity of doctrine, or took such singular precautions that nothing should escape from a member without the sanction and supervision of the head. Grant that the punishments of Jesuits in England were inflicted on them not as traitors, which was the fact, but as Catholics,—suppose that Elizabeth and James abandoned in this case their acknowledged and consistent policy of conciliating their Romanist subjects,—suppress all the history of the League,—let the bankruptcy of Lavalette be the dishonesty of an individual, not any way implicating the society,—allow that Borromeo, and Palafox, and Melchior Cano, with popes, and universities, and prelates, were all deceived in their prophecies and their facts,—charge Ganganelli with subjection to the monarchs of Europe,—give to the community the benefit of every doubt that can be raised upon the innumerable indictments against it, and let us suppose that it stood before us untried, as when it first presented itself to Paul III., only in the full development of its organization, and acknowledged principles as declared by itself and its panegyrists. It was in this form that the wisest, the most learned, and the most holy men in the English Church; men the farthest removed from any imputation of uncharitableness or laxity; discerned in it the spirit of Antichrist. And let us consider why.

When the Christian Church was first founded on the Apostles, its office and duty was committed to it in this remarkable form:—"Ye are witnesses of these things[2]." "Ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth[3]." "One must be ordained

[2] Luke xxiv. 48. [3] Acts i. 8.

to be a witness[4]." "Whereof we are all witnesses[5]." "Thou shalt be his witness unto all men of what thou hast seen and heard[6]." "To make thee a minister and a witness both of these things which thou hast seen, and of those things in the which I will appear unto thee[7]." "That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you[8]." The Church was placed upon the earth to be a witness to the truth, which it had received; and all its power, organization, and policy, even in the salvation of souls, was to be subordinated to this great end. The guidance and correction of man was in the main reserved to the internal working of a higher power than man. As a witness the Church was to go forth to the ends of the world,—as a witness to maintain inviolable the doctrine committed to its care,—as a witness to suffer persecution,—as a witness to die at the stake,—or, if a lot of less pain was appointed it, as a witness it was to stand armed with authority and power, and holding up its hands in prayer in the face of kings and people. We need not pause to show how all the other duties and blessings attached to the Church were not superseded, but insured by the steady fulfilment of this primary duty; nor how conformable this function of a witness is to the analogy of the Divine government generally, which neither excludes nor compels choice, but sets before us life and death, blessing and cursing, testifying to the end which awaits our conduct, but leaving our conduct free, even though disobedience and disorder, and the apparent frustration of the Divine will, is the consequence of the liberty permitted to us.

But this humble and limited function is little consistent with the pride and ambition of man; and the history of the Church consists of a gradual attempt to emancipate itself from its restraints, and to assume an office seemingly far more glorious, and far more immediately conducive to the good of man and to the glory of God—the office of government and direction. It was thus that in the intellectual East, intellect struggled to relieve itself from the fetters of a strict, defined, hereditary, unalterable creed—full of mysteries irreconcileable by reason, but all of them attested as revealed, and spread itself out into every form of heresy, as a teacher and moulder of human reason in subjects of religion, rather than as a simple attester to what it had heard and seen. And when the vitality and energy which animated the East in the first centuries, swept on like a wave towards the West, leaving all behind it a desolate waste, Rome caught the same impulse, though, as if the spirit and policy of government were inherent in the very soil of the Seven Hills, the struggle to escape from the ministration of a witness was transferred from the intellectual to

[4] Acts i. 22. [5] Acts ii. 32; iii. 15; x. 41. [6] Acts xxii. 15.
[7] Acts xxvi. 16. [8] John i. 3.

the moral nature, and the efforts of Rome were bent to rule the affections and the actions instead of the reason of man. From this point may be traced consecutively all the subsequent development and corruptions of the system of Romanism. Once assumed that the commission of the Church was to govern mankind, the success of its government became the only test of its fidelity. But to this success there were opposed a multitude of obstacles and restraints, all of them requiring to be removed. Power became necessary to rule, and unity of operation to power, and the suppression of Episcopal independence, and even of civil authority, to unity of spiritual operation; and to raise forces for this great work, not only were minds generally to be subdued and attached, but an ecclesiastical force was to be constituted, and doctrines modified, and practices introduced, which, however inconsistent with primitive example, all tended to the one great end—the direction and control of the world. As the end is greater than the means, it justifies the means, wherever no prior and positive prohibitions exist against them. These prohibitions it became necessary to remove, in order to facilitate the great work. Hence the gradual enlargement of the papal authority, till it became supreme over and capable of superseding all other authority upon earth, even though derived from heaven; and when all other authority was thus swallowed up in one, all duties became subordinated to one, and all traces of minor relations were blotted out. The single voice of the Romish Church was sufficient to dispense from every other obligation; and the relaxment of morals became co-extensive with the infringement upon the apostolical organization, and the corruption of the Catholic faith of the primitive Church. In one word, the whole life of Rome has been a struggle to sap and melt away those restraints upon the ambition of man which God has created in the moral world by subjecting us to a variety of obligations, and by distributing his power among many agents, just as he seems to have limited even his own omnipotence in nature, by fixing bounds which he does not pass, and by creating laws which can only be subdued to the service of man by combining obedience to them all, "*imperare parendo.*"

The end of such a struggle it was easy to foresee. As the dykes and dams which hemmed in the authority of Rome successively fell in, its rapacity rose higher. Every past victory swelled future claims, and encouraged a more reckless licence, till the patience of the world was exhausted, and the Reformation exploded. And at this moment what was the condition of its forces, and what progress had it made towards its vision of universal dominion? It had claimed to absorb in itself the whole

power of the episcopacy; but there were bishops like those of England prepared to reassume their apostolical privileges. It had disputed the supremacy of the Church with General Councils; but General Councils were still revered by a large portion of Christendom, as participating, if not overruling, the authority of the Romish see. It had set forth its own infallibility, and exerted it even by tampering with the Creed—the mysterious deposit of the faith, and the palladium of Christianity. To captivate and hold in subjection the minds of the people, it had created a machinery of confession and absolution, of penances and indulgences, and a lax system of casuistry to regulate it, so that even the worst excesses of Jesuit morality were able to defend themselves by the previous teaching of Romish doctors. It had dressed up a devotion with all outward appeals to the imagination, and had indulged the morbid feelings of superstition with the creation of its own gods by a Mariolatry and saint worship. And it had created the Inquisition. Having familiarized the world to the spectacle of a spiritual monarchy gradually establishing its own despotism, it was easy to undermine and even wage open war against the civil monarchies of the earth. Even without formally claiming a direct temporal power, the spiritual power involved this, whenever the temporal became connected with the spiritual; and when does this not take place? When may not the acts of the body be supposed to affect the state of the soul? Thus every exercise of temporal authority was practised by Rome even before the Jesuit system was thoroughly developed. Taxes were raised in foreign kingdoms—laws issued within them—appeals heard from them—statutes dispensed with—subjects released from their allegiance—kingdoms disposed of by gift—war levied against independent monarchs as against rebels;—but all this had been done as a struggle. It had encountered resistance. The resistance was now stronger than ever, and its own means of aggression, or of maintaining its position, were infinitely weaker. It could no longer count on the voluntary surrender of their privileges by the bishops; nor on the suspension of General Councils; nor on terrifying kings; nor on ruling the people, exasperated by oppression, and revelling in their newly-recovered liberty of thought. But one strong arm it still possessed—its monastic bodies.

The same characteristic law which turned the battles of the Church to points of doctrine in the East, and to points of practice and government in the West, had produced a similar difference in the eastern and the western monasticism. In the East, monasteries, as their name denoted, were sanctuaries of solitude and retirement for contemplation, prayer, and penitence. In the

West, they soon became the great organs of the secular operations of the Church—parts of the world, and exercising on it, exactly in proportion as they retained a Catholic instead of Roman character, a most salutary influence. They assumed the form of communities, charged with the spiritual care of districts, since converted into parishes—of great schools for learning and art, as well as for theology—of wealthy corporate bodies, balancing the struggles between the sovereign and the nobles—of institutions for charity and hospitality—of consecrated homes, where the loose and scattered atoms of society might be gathered and converted into solid masses, under the shelter and in defence of truth and holiness. But with all this inestimable good there was blended an inestimable evil. Detached, individually, from the ordinary position of citizens, by their vows and their celibacy—withdrawn by exemptions of various kinds from the control of their natural spiritual superintendents, the bishops—erected almost into an independent empire in the midst of the temporal empire—bound together by the strongest ties of spiritual union—and taught to look to Rome in all things as their creator, and patron, and protector, and reformer—they became, in the hands of Rome, an engine of enormous power, to be wielded against the civil authority. They were encamped and garrisoned in every country as its subject legions, more or less pledged to obedience, and interested in maintaining the Roman sway; and thus not by the mere rapacity of spoliation, but by the necessity of warfare, the first point attacked by the monarchs of Europe, who reasserted their independence of Rome, were the monastic institutions. They were the concentration and last exhibition of that temporal power which Rome had always sought for, and had before acquired by the submission of sovereigns to its will, and without which, however unnecessary to the functions of a witness and a martyr, the functions of a ruler and governor could never be discharged. Break them down, and Rome would be powerless.

Of the mode in which this attack was conducted, the nature of the spoliation, or the purposes to which it was applied, we need not speak. To sever them from Rome, and yet preserve them to Christianity—this, the true and glorious task of a great statesman—was perhaps beyond the power, as it was assuredly beyond the thought, of the exasperated hands which stormed and pillaged them.

But with their fall the right arm of Rome was fractured; and to all human calculation, it was about to have sunk into insignificance, and to realize the dream so often cherished at this day, by minds insensible to its might, of an effete and powerless old man

sitting desolate amidst the ruins of his empire, and fulminating his futile edicts over a world that mocked and hated him.

But at this juncture succour was sent it. The same mysterious doom which raised up Luther to attack, permitted Ignatius to arise to defend the shattered empire of the Papacy. Bold, ardent, chivalrous, and enthusiastic, full of an indomitable patience, of a passionate zeal, of a picturesque and romantic imagination, armed with all the precedents and habits of military discipline and dominion, wrapt up in a more sanguine devotion to the cause, as he conceived, of Heaven, from the memory of a past life devoted to voluptuousness and sin, and gifted with that powerful fascination over other minds, which is exerted by an entire abandonment of self, and earnest absorption in one grand pursuit, Ignatius, aided and directed by the cooler and more subtle policy of Laines, constructed and offered to the Roman pontiff the wonderful machine of Jesuitism. It was the full development, the final perfection of the monastic and mendicant orders, considered as the instruments of Rome in extending her dominion. To speak in their own repeated metaphor, it was the spiritual Roman legion, brought, after a series of experiments and conflicts, to its acme and completion, as combining the highest degree possible of solidity and massiveness with flexibility and elasticity.

And before we examine more minutely into its structure, let us consider its destination.

I. It was placed at the disposal, not of the whole Catholic church, nor even of the Romish church, controlled by the supremacy of a General Council, but of the Roman pontiff individually. It was like an army of Janizaries, or Mamelukes, or any body of foreign mercenary troops, who, in a kingdom distracted by the claims of an usurping sovereign—claims hitherto disputed by legislatures and parliaments—should devote themselves to the service of the usurper, without any reference whatever to the constitutional limitations on his despotism. "Soli Domino atque Romano Pontifici ejus in terris Vicario servire[9]," is the object and motto of the society. It is the prætorian army of the pope, and as such its institution was regarded at first by the Roman pontiff himself, and to the present day by moderate Romanists all over the world, with as much jealousy and alarm as by any Protestant communions. Its power to serve the pope was the measure of its power to overawe him. And the Gallican Church, with its modified reverence for the Papacy, and its reserved submission to a General Council, was even more embarrassed by its

[9] Bull of Paul III., A.D. 1540.

fears of a further subversion of the polity of the Church Catholic than Germany or England.

II. This new association was destined to undertake the functions of the whole hierarchical body. It was not designed to supply certain minor and subordinate wants in the polity of the church, to strengthen the hands of bishops, to fulfil works of charity under them, to undertake missions at their bidding, or to form what the English Church so much needs, corporate Levitical institutions, under the control of the rightful ecclesiastical authorities. It was to trespass on and absorb in itself all the functions for which the Almighty established the orders of bishop, priest, and deacon; the cure of souls (profectum animarum), the public preaching of the Gospel (fidei propagationem per publicas prædicationes), the ministry of the Word (verbi Dei ministerium), spiritual discipline (spiritualia exercitia), works of charity (opera charitatis), the instruction of the young and ignorant (puerorum ac rudium in Christianismo institutionem), and, above all, the giving spiritual comfort, by hearing confessions (in confessionibus audiendis spiritualem consolationem præcipue intendat[1]). It was, in fact, to supersede by a new association the Divine organization of Christian pastors. Let us place aside all the historical facts which show that this avowed design has been practically carried out, all the remonstrances and complaints which have been made against its actual aggressions and usurpations by Romanists themselves. Let us suppose that the evil of the institution was neutralized by the moderation of its conductors, and that the innumerable accusations against them were all the results of jealousy or ignorance—and even then, in what light must a Christian mind regard the institution itself, prior to and apart from all experience of its actual working—a human hierarchy created as a substitute for a divine one?

III. The Society presents itself as an absolute monarchy: "Universam gubernandi rationem . . . Ignatius fundator . . . monarchicam tamen et in definitionibus unius superioris arbitrio contentam esse decrevit[2]." Now these remarks are not so much addressed to minds to whom these words will at once suggest ideas of danger and evil, of human reason oppressed, and Christian liberty threatened; they are intended rather for those who, sighing over the distractions of the Church, over the licentiousness of the people, and the disruption of the bonds of faith which once held society together, gladly catch at any project which promises to realize their dream of unity, and concord, and obedience. With this yearning they look to Rome. She alone has professed

[1] Bull of Paul III. [2] Bull of Pope Gregory XIV.

the great work of gathering all the scattered and conflicting members of the Christian body, and uniting them under one head. Unity is her badge and boast. Her history is but a series of successive attempts to realize it; and the Jesuit monarchy framed upon her principles, and dovetailed into her system, is but another, if it be not the final, stage of the development of this ruling idea. But what is this ruling idea? Is it in fact, as in name, the same with the idea of unity stamped upon the Church by its Divine Author, confirmed by Scripture, exhibited in the first ages of the Gospel, and illustrated by experience and reason? Or is it something wholly different from this, incompatible with it, and destructive of it?

Let us imagine a case.

We boast, or rather it should be said, we once did boast of the English constitution. It was the admiration of the profoundest political philosophers, and its most prominent claim to admiration was its monarchical form—its unity; this gave to it its stability and permanence, its energy and its peace. But with this there were coupled other recognized and essential elements, which often seemed to embarrass and disturb it. Stubborn parliaments, immutable laws, hereditary indefeasible privileges, belonging even to the lowest orders of society, an independent spiritual authority, established within the very heart of the empire; bulwarks and barriers against arbitrary power set on every side round the throne of the monarch, who was yet, by the principles of the constitution, the fountain of all honour, the lord of the wealth, and the disposer of the force of the nation; all this, both in theory and practice, came into strong contrast, and often into violent collision, with the idea of perfect unity. Let us remove them. Place the monarch on his throne, relieved from the incumbrance of any counsellors, capable of enacting and of dispensing with laws by his own voice, unawed by any independent equal or rival at his side, unfettered by any restrictions against aggressions on the rights of others, and armed with the means of dispersing or coercing any opposition to his will; and then indulge the contemplation of this perfected and completed unity in the body politic, compared with its previous embarrassments and counteractions. An unity, indeed, there will be, but an unity of a very different nature from that which is commanded by the great Author of society, and is necessary for the well-being of man. It will be unity of person and of place, a material nominal unity, under one human being. But to this will be sacrificed another and a far higher unity: unity of truth, unity of mind, unity of affection, unity of duration. Absolute, arbitrary, unbalanced power must generate arbitrary acts; and arbitrary

acts must rouse discord and rebellion: and rebellion must break to fragments the one mass of the empire, and dislocate its chain of succession, till even the shadow of unity is lost, and nothing remains but dissension and conflict.

This latter process has been the history of Romanism in the Church, and of Jesuitism within the bosom of Romanism. The Gospel unity of the Church is one thing, the unity with which they have endeavoured to perfect, or rather to supersede it, is another. What the former was to be we know: "One body, and one spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism; one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all[s]." But this unity of the body was not incompatible—rather it was strictly combined with a plurality of members, and a diversity of operation. It was essentially balanced by a body of twelve Apostles (not one Apostle), distinct from and authorized to confront each other—by multitudes of distinct churches radiating from them severally into every part of the world—by the independence of the episcopacy—by a variability in outward rites and ceremonies, according to climates, temperaments, and circumstances—by the Divine supremacy of kings and princes—by differences of opinion on subjects not defined by Revelation—even by the existence of sects and heresies, which the Divine government tolerated, as it tolerates moral evil in the world, rather than exclude them by excluding the exercise of our free agency, reason, and faith. The Divine organization of the Church, like the political organization of the English constitution, or of any constitution adapted to the infirmities of human nature, with all its earnest insistance upon unity, did not exclude variety, multiplicity, oppositions, even discords. Heaven tolerated them, as Heaven works within the bounds which it has set to its own omnipotence, educing good out of evil, peace out of war, harmony out of reconciled dissensions, and perfection out of conflicting imperfections; slowly indeed and gradually, and often to human eyes imperceptibly, but yet fully and surely in those grand cycles, through which its operations are to be traced, and none of which we may dare to call complete till they close in another world—in eternity, and Heaven. Heaven tolerated them, but man could not. And thus Catholicism sunk gradually into Romanism.

But the Theory of Papal Unity, at the period of the Reformation, was scarcely more than theory: the vision had been formed, the claims involved in it asserted, and the effects of it both upon the mind of the ruler and the temper of the ruled already exhi-

[s] Ephes. iv. 4.

bited. But the result was the same as must follow upon any attempt to establish a despotism with inadequate forces. It was rebellion, and a rebellion which threatened the very existence of religion. And the only means which Rome possessed for suppressing it, were deficient in the very principle most essential to her whole system—in unity, and therefore in power. They consisted mainly, if not exclusively, of the Religious Orders. But these were still scattered through different countries, subject to local influences of patriotism and loyalty, in themselves endowed with a considerable degree of internal independence of their several generals, confined in their operations by their original destination and constitution, and in many cases animated with a jealous animosity against each other. Already some attempt had been made to frame an ecclesiastical legion more available for the service of Rome than the old monastic orders, as the old monastic orders had been more available than the divinely appointed ecclesiastical hierarchy. And the creation of the Mendicant orders, with their increased dependence upon the Papacy, their commission to interfere with the duties of the secular clergy, and their relaxation from inconvenient restrictions, was an intermediate step in the pursuit of this object. But even this machinery was destitute of sufficient pliability and accommodation to the exigencies of the case; and still more was it deficient in solidity and unity. It was as if the mercenary troops employed in the establishment of a despotism were composed of two or more national bodies, jealous and rivals of each other, and distributed under jealous and rival commanders. A consolidated army was required, and the Society of Jesuitism supplied it.

This necessity of giving unity to the spiritual forces of the Papacy is alleged by Jesuitism itself as the reason of their monarchical form. "Regna plurima, atque clarissima, immensis naturæ divortiis sejuncta, in unum nisi ab uno redigi non potuisse[4]." And it may suggest the following reflections:—If the Papal theory of unity, which is the life and spring of all its corruptions, be thus essentially vicious and destructive of true Christian unity, how is it likely to be affected by the possession of an instrument framed to subserve and support it upon the same vicious principles? Is it not true, that one of the last and strongest hopes for the correction of arbitrary power, and of its inevitable abuses, lies in some discordance between itself and the instruments which it employs? "He who uses instruments," says Burke, "finds also impediments." Tyrants are destroyed by their own satellites. Despotic aggressions are checked perpetually by the reluctance

[4] Imago Prim. Sæcul., lib. i. cap. 6.

or intractability of those who are to execute them. The check and the safety lie in the chance of this resistance: and this resistance depends on the number and variety of the hands to be employed, or on some difference of temper and spirit opposing them to the will of their employer. But remove these chances; make the instrument a single individual, that is, place under the absolute control of an individual an enormous mass of forces, and imbue that individual with precisely the same vicious principles as his employer, and what must be the end?

There is, indeed, one chance remaining, that the very identity of vicious principle; the coincidence, for instance, in the two minds, the master's and the servant's—of a lust for rule, or of a mere intellectual theory of an absolute dominion in the Church, may bring about a collision. Where two minds seek one object which cannot be enjoyed by both, there must be war, and to this war we may look as our hope for either the suppression of Jesuitism, or the depression of the Papacy. The absolute dominion of the general of the Jesuits, and the absolute dominion of the Pope, may seem so incompatible, that one must annihilate the other, or at least reduce it to some subordinate position.

But this is not always the case. There are instances, and the present is one, in which the existence and power of two parties are so dependent upon each other, that notwithstanding perpetual jealousies, grievances, and mutual aggressions, neither can destroy the other without destroying itself, nor aggrandize itself except by aggrandizing the other. This was the situation of the great civil and hierarchical powers in those vast oriental monarchies, before which the duration and the magnitude of most modern empires fade into insignificance. The all but omnipotence of each party was maintained by the external support and testimony of the other. Together they formed the two sides of the arch, capable by their mutual resistance and mutual pressure of supporting any weight. And the fall of those empires may be traced in almost every instance to an abandonment of this talismanic principle—when sovereigns suppressed the hierarchy, or the hierarchy usurped the sovereignty. A spiritual authority is powerless for dominion; it can only witness, and suffer, and die as a martyr to purchase life by that very death—unless it be supported by an independent secular arm: and a secular arm must be powerless, it will never command the reverence, or sympathy, or obedience of the higher order of human minds, nor even of the superstitious mass, unless it be accredited and consecrated by an independent Spiritual Hand. How shall a man preach except he be sent? How can he demand obedience solely upon his own testimony?

Nor is the obligation limited to one side; Rome also requires external testimony to accredit her own extraordinary claims. Now that the forgeries of antiquity are exploded, and the pretensions of Rome are found and acknowledged to be novelties, having no foundation but her own word, the Papacy must look elsewhere for some external witness. It is a law of the Gospel, a law of human nature, a law of reason; but by her own theory she is excluded from finding such a witness within the range of the existing Catholic Church: all its branches, by her own declaration, ramify from herself, draw their vitality from her fountain head, are subject to her dominion. They cannot, therefore, be independent of her. They cannot give an independent witness. But if another power can be created by herself, which nevertheless may claim a distinct Divine authority for its commission, if it can assume the form and functions, and almost the name of the Church itself, and stand upon a footing at all distinct from its creator, it assumes the character of an external witness, and may deliver an independent and therefore a valid and credible testimony. Let us not think that this advantage is slight, or the reasoning far-fetched. Let us rather bring to bear upon it those singular features in the Jesuit system which enable it directly to answer this purpose.

Some preparation for this assumption of the character of the whole Church by some particular portion within it (this premature sifting and severance of the Invisible from the Visible Church, so prominent in Puritanism), was made by the pretension of the See of Rome to exclude from salvation all who were excluded from its own communion. A still farther development took place within the Church of Rome itself, by the tendency to identify the saints and elect of God with the members of the monastic bodies, as distinct from the secular clergy. A still farther extravagance of the same rationalistic and Puritan principle was seen in the blasphemous parallels drawn between our Blessed Lord and the founders of the Mendicant order, especially St. Francis. But it reached, perhaps, its final stage in the vaunts and self-panegyrics of the Jesuits.

The assumption of such a title in itself involved the whole pretension, and was thought sufficient by the clergy of France again and again to justify the most vigorous opposition to their entrance into that kingdom[5].

"Though there was no other charge against you," says Pasquier in his pleadings for the University of Paris, "this mere name of Jesuit which you have so arrogantly appropriated to

[5] Plaidoyer de M. Pasquier pour l'Université de Paris, Annales, vol. i. p. 43.

yourselves, and have so often promised to abjure in France without keeping your word, would be sufficient to condemn you to the severest punishment." "To call themselves the followers of Jesus (said a pope himself, Sixtus V.) is to deny the claims of all others to be his followers;" just as Rome's restriction to herself of the titles of Catholic and Apostolic has had the effect, in the estimation of her sons, of unchurching all the rest of the world. But Jesuits went still farther. They assumed the title and character of Apostles. "Perspicuum est societatem Jesu ab Apostolorum Instituto ac Religione non differre nisi tempore[6]." The express author of the society was our Lord himself[7]. It was the work also of the Virgin Mary ("Beneficium Mariæ," "Ignatius opus Virginis . . . . illum enim vitæ meliori misericors Mater peperit"); and then follows a blasphemous parallel between the relation of Ignatius to the Virgin and that of our Lord[8]. It is a peculiar society attached to Christ himself ("Qui huic militiæ dant nomen, non in cœtum Ignatii, sed in Filii Dei peculiarem quandam societatem ac militiam intelligunt se vocari"); and the pledge which every Christian makes in his baptism is here applied to his entrance into the body of the Jesuits. It was the subject of Prophecy[9], not only by modern saints, but by Isaiah, St. John, St. Thomas, and others[1]. The spiritual exercises of Ignatius were dictated by the Virgin. "Scripsit ille quidem Ignatius, sed dictante Mariâ[2]." She appeared to him often to assist him in his work, and to declare her satisfaction with it[3]. The constitutions of the society are alike the work of herself and of our Lord. For Ignatius declares, it is said, that the Mediators ("quorum nomine Jesum designat et Mariam") appeared to him in the course of his work; "Ne nesciat societas parere se legibus ab Jesu et Mariâ magis quam ab Ignatio latis." It is the house of wisdom ("domus sapientiæ"). All the scriptural types of the heavenly hierarchy and of the Church are realized in it[4]. Salvation is ensured by membership with it. And when a Jesuit dies, our Lord advances to meet him, and receive him into heaven. Or to sum up all, it is the final development of Revelation. And these words may be fitly used: "God in these last days hath spoken unto us by his son Ignatius, whom he hath appointed heir of all things[5]."

With this last declaration we must close. There is now lying

[6] Imago Prim. Sæc., lib. i. c. 3.
[7] "Jesus primus ac præcipuus auctor societatis."—Imago Pr. Sæc., lib. i. c. 3.
[8] Imago Pr. Sæc., lib. i. c. 5. [9] Ibid., lib. i. c. 2. [1] Ibid.
[2] Ibid., lib. i. c. 5. [3] Ibid. [4] Elogia, Gomez, Preface.
[5] See "Censure de la Faculté de Théologie de Paris; Annales des soi-disans Jésuites," vol. ii. p. 375.

before us not only the "Imago Primi Sæculi"—a Jesuit work—but another, entitled "Elogia," by Christopher Gomez, also a Jesuit, published at Antwerp in 1677, and solemnly dedicated to the Church of Rome. After a variety of panegyrics, in many cases just, upon the zeal and learning of the society, it closes with a collection of declarations in its favour by our Lord, the Virgin Mary, apostles, saints, angels, and demons. We have no wish to shock Christian feeling by the repetition of these blasphemies; nor is this the place to do more than indicate a general line of inquiry to be pursued by those who would candidly and conscientiously pronounce on the nature of the institution. But Jesuitism is in fact exhibited and maintained as a concentration and quintessence of the Church, as the army of the Church, as its hierarchy, as the crew in the boat of St. Peter, the only hope of navigating it through the storm[6]. "Expertes et validos remiges

[6] Perhaps the best illustration of its theory on this point is to be found in the subjoined account of the notorious painting in the chapel of the Jesuit College at Bellon, which was laid before the Parliament of Paris in 1763. It was entitled, "Typus Religionis," or the Emblematic Representation of the Religious Order of Jesuits. We have extracted it from the Compte-rendu :—

"Nous avons donc observé que dans le dit tableau la Religion est représentée sous l'emblême d'un très grand Vaisseau, qui cingle à pleines voiles de la Mer du Siècle au Port du Salut. Au milieu de ce vaisseau, et sur le tillac, S. Ignace, tenant à la main le nom de Jésus, paraît à la tête de huit autres Fondateurs d'Ordres; l'on ne voit dans ce vaisseau d'autres personnages que des Religieux de ces neuf ordres différens : ce qui donne lieu de présumer qu'on a cherché à confondre la religion avec l'état religieux. Cette conjecture paraît-d'autant mieux fondée que l'on n'y apperçoit ni Pape, ni Evêque (qui ne soit chef d'ordre), ni Prêtre, ni aucun Séculier; il est monté par ces seuls Religieux; ce sont eux-seuls qui le conduisent, et y font toute la manœuvre; partout les Jésuites tiennent le premier rang; les autres Religieux ne paraissent y agir que sous leurs ordres, et en Subalternes; bien plus, quoique le S. Esprit enfle les voiles de son souffle, et pousse le vaisseau, c'est un Jésuite qui, chargé du gouvernail, le compas à la main, en dirige la route : au-dessous de ce Pilote on lit : 'Imitatio Vitæ Christi.' Ne paraît-il pas évident que ce tableau n'a été fait que pour persuader que les Jésuites seuls sont propres à conduire dans les voies du salut? Nous avons observé encore qu'à le suite de ce vaisseau viennent deux petites Barques, sur lesquelles on lit : 'Naves secularium quibus arma spiritualia à viris religionis suppeditantur.' Dans ces barques sont pêle-mêle le Pape, un Cardinal, un Roi de France, des Evêques, plusieurs têtes couronnées, des personnes de tous états, et de tout sexe. Des Religieux d'Ordres différens distribuent du haut du grand Vaisseau aux Séculiers, qui sont dans les nacelles, des faisceaux d'armes composés de sabres, de boucliers, de carquois, et de flèches; un autre Religieux leur présente des Livres et des Scapulaires, et un Jésuite en surplis paraît prêcher et présider à la distribution de ces prétendues armes spirituelles; à côté de celui-là un autre Jésuite tient l'extrémité d'une corde, qu'il a jetée dans les petites Barques pour les attirer au grand Vaisseau. Nous n'avons pu voir qu'avec scandale le Pape, les Evêques, etc., hors du Vaisseau de la Religion n'en approcher qu'à l'aide et par le secours de ce Jésuite; nous n'avons pas été moins surpris de voir que ces armes qu'on qualifie de *spirituelles*, ne sont autres que celles dont on se sert pour la destruction des corps. Du même côté, sur la Mer du Siècle au haut du tableau, s'élèvent plusieurs points de rochers, dont la plus élevée est surmontée d'une Thiare, une autre d'un Chapeau de Cardinal, quelques autres de Mitres, de Couronnes, et de la Bannière de Malthe; au-dessus

ad frangendos pelagi naufragium nobis et exitium quovis momento minitantes fluctus[7]."

Now, without impugning the motives, or giving credence even to the best attested histories of the practical working of this body, granting that it consists only of saintly and self-devoted men, and is animated with but one spirit—zeal for the greater glory of God (ad majorem Dei gloriam), and thirst for the spiritual welfare of their neighbours—let us suppose a similar institution to be formed under similar circumstances within our own Church. We believe that the organization and polity of the Church was no less a matter of divine institution than its doctrines—that, indirectly, they are of scarcely less importance—that they are the glass and the lamp, in which the light of truth is preserved, and that amidst the rude gusts and storms of the world, whether the glass be shattered, or the oil exhausted, matters little. In either case the light must be extinguished. Schism is the inevitable attendant upon disorganization, heresy upon schism, unbelief upon heresy. We believe, also, that the principles upon which the English Church is organized, the independence of its episcopacy, the privileges of its pastors, the mutual counteractions of its hierarchy, are agreeable to the institutions of the Apostles and of our Lord. Let us suppose that these principles had been corrupted or nearly lost—that as the Roman See succeeded, step by step, in swallowing up the power of the Church, so some one see in England, Canterbury, for instance, in the face of protests and remonstrances, had still drawn under its power the whole ecclesiastical authority of England. Let the fearful consequences of this usurpation have been manifested in the distractions of the Church, the alienation of the State, the demoralization and increasing ignorance of the people, and the gross corruption of the inward spirit, as of the outward doctrines and polity of Christianity. Let an effort and a struggle then be made to restore the primitive system, and to coerce the usurping see. At this moment let a body of zealous, fervent, learned, enthusiastic men bind themselves together by the most stringent ties, and in a form unheard of in the Church, to enter the battle in behalf of the usurper. Let them devote themselves wholly to him, and stand forward as the asserters of his most extravagant claims. Let them claim to themselves

du tout est écrit: 'Superbia Vitæ.' Autour de ces rochers sont représentés les Sept Péchés Capitaux sous l'emblême de sept petits Brigantins portant chacun le nom d'un Péché; au-dessous du tout est un sentence commençant par ces mots: 'Initium omnis peccati est superbia.'"

A more detailed account of this picture, by no means the only one of its kind which has been exhibited by the society, may be seen in the "Annales de la Société des soi-disans Jésuites," vol. i. p. 626.

[7] Bull of Pope Pius VII., restoring the order.

almost all the offices of the Church, and describe themselves as the elect portion of the Church, beyond whose pale nothing but inferiority can be found. Let them claim a divine origin, and the sanction of express revelation for their institutes. And, lastly, with one heart and soul, under the command of one leader of the profoundest policy and most unwearied energy, and separated from the rest of the Church, let them be sent forth into the country, to preach from our pulpits, to invade our universities, to wander at will through our dioceses, to draw into their hands the whole education of the country, and to establish themselves in every part of society, by every fireside, from the court to the college, and from the college to the cottage, as rulers of the conscience and masters of the secrets of the whole nation.

These are but a few traits in the picture to be drawn; but are they sufficient, or not, to alarm the mind of any one who truly and sincerely believed the system of the Church to be primitive, and to be momentous? Would they justify him, or not, in at once rejecting and expelling such a society from the bosom of his country, as the parent of inevitable discord, and the corrupter of discipline and doctrine?

But it will be said this zeal and energy is supplementary and subsidiary—it does not, and need not clash with the operations of the regular clergy, and must be controllable within proper bounds by their authority and privileges, especially by the superintendence of the episcopacy. What is the fact? They come armed by their own declaration with more than forty bulls of popes, exempting them from the jurisdiction of every ordinary, and releasing them from all the restrictions by which even the monastic and mendicant orders were confined in their operations. The exemptions by which these had been withdrawn from the control of the rightful authorities in the Church, and placed at the disposal of the Pope, had already sufficiently disturbed the polity, and infected the doctrine and practice of Christianity; but even these had not given sufficient independence, freedom, and pliability to the papal legion. Accordingly, Paul III. gives to every one licensed by the general of the society for the time being, the right of preaching both to clergy and to people in any churches, public square, or any place whatever, "alias ubique locorum." He gives in the same bull to all priests of the society, the privilege of confessing every one who should come to them from whatever parish, "undecunque accedentium;" of absolving from all offences, however enormous ("quantumcunque gravibus et enormibus"), not merely those which are reserved by the Romish system to the bishop, but even those reserved to the Pope, "etiam Sedi Apostolicæ reservatis;" of releasing them from all sentences,

censures, and punishment ecclesiastical, with one exception, of those contained in the bull "Cœna Domini;" of commuting, with some exceptions, all vows ("vota quæcunque") into other works of charity; of celebrating mass at any time of the day, and of demanding the assistance and support of all ordinaries in maintaining these privileges, even by ecclesiastical censures, against all opponents ("contradictores quoslibet et rebelles"). In another bull he prohibits any member of the society from accepting any office or dignity in the Church, though at the command of his prince, without the consent of the general[8]. All appeals from the society are prohibited. The society is not compelled to depute any of its members to undertake duties, such as preaching, or missions, or other ecclesiastical functions, at the request either of patriarchs, archbishops, bishops, or other ecclesiastical authorities. And if deputed, the parties still remain under the control of the society, and may be removed by the general at his pleasure. The power of absolving from all crimes, and from all censures, suspensions, interdicts, excommunications, "aliisque ecclesiasticis et sæcularibus sententiis," inflicted by any person whatever ("a jure vel ab homine quomodolibet latis et promulgatis"), except in certain cases reserved to the apostolic see, is then conferred upon the general, and may be extended by him to all persons within the society, or temporarily placed under its spiritual direction; which absolution shall be void, unless the party receiving it enter presently into the society, and take the vows. The whole society, all its members, and all their property whatever, are next exempted from every control of every ordinary, and placed under the protection of the Pope. ("Ipsamque Societatem, et universos illius socios et personas, illorumque bona quæcunque ab omni superioritate, jurisdictione, correctione quorumcunque ordinariorum eximimus et liberamus, et sub nostrâ et præfatæ Sedis protectione suscipimus"). Any member who quits the society contrary to the statutes, in whatever habit or religious order the apostate may be found, ("in quocunque habitu apostatas prædictos contigerit inveniri,") may be excommunicated, seized, incarcerated, and in other ways placed under discipline, ("et alias suæ disciplinæ submittere,") and for this purpose the aid of the secular arm may be required. In the time of an interdict, though inflicted even by the Pope himself, they may within closed doors celebrate mass, and receive and administer the sacraments of the Church to others, provided these be persons not specially named in the interdict, nor the cause of the offence. But all those who show favour to the society, ("qui in ipsorum Præpositorum et

[8] Litt. Apost., p. 19.

Sociorum morantur obsequiis,") may receive freely from the Jesuits, even during an interdict, the sacraments of the Church, and be buried in their cemeteries. The same privilege is given to all the children, servants, officers, and workmen employed by the society. No ecclesiastical sentence or excommunication is to be inflicted by any bishop or prelate against any member of the society, contrary to its privileges, the interpretation of which is reserved to the Pope, ("quorum [privilegiorum] interpretationem nobis et Apostolicæ sedi reservamus;") and if inflicted, any such sentence is, *ipso facto*, void, ("et si tulerint, eo ipso irrita, nulliusque roboris vel momenti sit, et esse censeatur.") Those who frequent the churches of the society to hear their sermons and receive the sacraments from them, are not bound to attend their own parish churches. All the priests of the society licensed by the general, wherever they are staying, *pro tempore*, may have oratories, and there celebrate mass on a portable altar. The general may present any member in any place to any bishop, and require the bishop to admit him to holy orders unreservedly ("absque omni promissione vel obligatione ipsorum ordinandorum fratrum"). With a licence from the general they may live familiarly with heretics, excommunicated persons, schismatics, and infidels. They are exempted from any claim which may be made upon them to undertake any office of visitation, of administering justice, or protecting nuns. Their property of all kinds is exempted from all tithes, ecclesiastical charges, subsidies, and provisions whatever. Any house, church, college, cell, or oratory given, or built for the society, is by that very act to be considered as already sanctioned by the Pope. If the bishop of the diocese should delay beyond four months, any other bishop may be called in to consecrate the church or cemetery; and all and several archbishops, bishops, prelates, and ordinaries, are enjoined to throw no obstructions in the way of erecting any buildings the society may think proper. Rigid as the Roman Church professes to be in excluding from holy orders those who are subject to any irregularity of birth, ("ex adulterio, sacrilegio, incestu, et quovis alio nefario et illicito coitu provenientem,") all this is dispensed with in the case of those who take the vow of Jesuitism. And notwithstanding any obstacle, whether of birth, or other nature, except homicide, bigamy, and mutilation of the limbs, they may be admitted to the priesthood, and the irregularity be dispensed with by the general. The consent of the rector of the parish is not to be required for hearing confessions, or administering the sacrament, except at the feast at Easter. Plenary indulgence is given to all those who visit any church of the society named by the general on one day in the year. On other days indulgences

of many years are granted in the other churches. The general may in any place appoint readers in theology without asking the consent of any third party ("alterius licentiâ ad id minime requisitâ"). The companions of the society serving as missionaries in heathen countries may absolve from all crimes, even those specified in the bull "Cœna Domini;" may dispense with irregularities in marriage; may erect and remodel churches, hospitals, and other religious places; may consecrate ecclesiastical vestments, altars, and cemeteries, if a bishop be not there; and make and change, add to, or detract from any ordinance or statute thereunto pertaining. They may celebrate mass twice a day. And all these privileges, licences, and indulgences may be distributed, not only by the general, but by any vicegerents appointed by him. The body thus armed, is then solemnly recommended to the favour and protection of all potentates, both temporal and spiritual, who are enjoined not to permit them to be molested or interfered with by any ordinaries whatever, ("per locorum Ordinarios, aut quoscunque alios, quomodo libet indebitè molestari,") but are required to act when called upon by the Jesuits as their conservator judges, and to undertake their defence, and fulminate even the excommunications of the Church against the aggressors on the order, whoever they may be, of patriarchal, archiepiscopal, episcopal, or any worldly dignity whatsoever.

It is probably unnecessary to go further. Let us realize the operation of these privileges and exemptions extracted from a single bull, and then ask if a body thus constituted could be admitted into the Christian Church without entirely breaking up its organization, and disturbing its peace? But these are not all. There follows upon this bull of Paul III., a bull of Julius III[9]. If there is one duty natural and almost necessary to a community of priests living together, it is that of social prayer. The Jesuits are expressly exempted from it. They are thus guarded against being confounded with religious orders whose first object was devotion. Their profession lies in the world, amidst studies or secular pursuits, which must not be interrupted by the claims of public worship. And this semi-secularization is still further secured by permission to conform in dress, living, and other exterior circumstances, to the ordinary practice of clergymen. Whatever self-denial they may choose to exert is to be offered to Heaven (ex devotione, non ex obligatione), as a free-will act of devotion, not as imposed by the rules of the society. In all this there is much which is plausible. But the point of view in

[9] Litteræ Apostolicæ, p. 28.

which it is to be considered here, is its effect of emancipating the members of the society from a number of restraints imposed upon the monastic bodies, and which materially obstructed the freedom of their action. They thus possess all the social advantages of the regular, and all the ordinary advantages of the secular clergy. The flexibility of the legion becomes complete. Another bull of Julius III.[1] enables the general to give dispensations to members of the society from fasting, and to absolve from heresy. It confirms the privileges already granted, and secures them against any future revocation or infringement in any point even by papal decrees. It allows the general and officers appointed by him, to alter the order of Divine Service, and to commute the recitation of the office in case of sickness, for some slighter prayers. It then permits the Jesuit colleges in any university to confer degrees upon their own scholars, whether within or without the university, provided the universities refuse to grant those degrees gratuitously: and such degrees are to convey the same title, privileges, and advantages, as the degrees of the universities themselves[2]. Pius IV. allows them to build their colleges in any place, notwithstanding the privileges of other religious orders, which provided that such erections should not take place within a certain distance of their own foundations[3]. In another bull he declares it inexpedient that the scholars of the Jesuit colleges should take degrees in the regular universities, on account not only of the expense, but of the oaths and obligations there required. And he renews the exemption from tithes and other ecclesiastical charges[4]. Pius V. renews the right of seizing, excommunicating, incarcerating, or in other ways punishing, even by the aid of the secular arm, those who quit the society without its permission[5]. In another bull[6], he prohibits the capitular bodies in each college from effecting contracts, reserving them all to the general: by which means the several colleges are in a great degree emancipated from many financial embarrassments. Their several estates are not made liable to answer their several obligations. The whole mass of property belonging to the body is thrown into one, and may be transferred from college to college, and from kingdom to kingdom, at the will of one individual[7]. By a subsequent bull of Pius V., the prelectors of the Jesuit colleges in any university are allowed to deliver public lectures; so that during two hours in the morning, and one in the afternoon, they do not interfere with the university lectures. And the authorities of the several

[1] Litteræ Apostolicæ, p. 36. [2] Ibid., p. 38. [3] Ibid., p. 41.
[4] Ibid., p. 45. [5] Ibid., p. 49. [6] Ibid., p. 53.
[7] For a development of the consequences of this provision, see "Compte-rendu par Monclar," p. 443, &c.

universities are warned, under the pain of excommunication, against presuming under any pretence to molest these colleges. By another bull, all the privileges of the Mendicant orders are extended to the Jesuits as a Mendicant order, notwithstanding they possess colleges, and property attached to them—a singular problem to be solved: themselves to be at once poor and rich—a beggar and a prince; and yet one necessary to be solved by a body which was to concentrate in itself the power and influence, and advantages of all the members of the Church, however incompatible with each other; and was to possess with the poor the credit of poverty, and with the wealthy the dignity of wealth. As a singular accident, the very next bull is rendered necessary by the "divers kinds of temporal property possessed by the Jesuit colleges, and the many lawsuits in which the society was involved in order to preserve and recover them," (propter bona temporalia conservanda et recuperanda lites aliaque forensia frequenter subire necessario cogeretur.) It develops fully the appointment of conservator judges, a singularly ingenious contrivance, by which the society, when involved in any contest for its privileges or possessions, was authorized to select some influential person, archbishop, bishop, canon, vicar, or official general, to act summarily in their defence, either by ecclesiastical censures or the secular arm, and in opposition to any other religious communities: by this means throwing the whole onus of its defence upon a party external to itself; and at the same time dividing and ranging against each other the forces of its opponents. To this is appended a clause enabling one conservator judge to prosecute and conclude a process commenced by another; so that if the society should be dissatisfied with the energy or judgment of their first choice, they might be allowed to make another [8]. By another bull of Gregory XIII., A.D. 1575, all the accumulated rights, privileges, immunities, exemptions, indulgences, remissions, and graces, ever given or to be given hereafter to any ecclesiastical persons, bodies, or places, whether secular or regular, (tam sæcularibus quam regularibus,) are all conceded to the Jesuits, to be distributed among them by the general, as the fountain of honour and of mercy independent of the pope. This virtual transference of the highest ecclesiastical prerogatives from the pope to the general is not to be overlooked. It is profoundly significant. One exception is made: that the members of the society may not exercise the right of choosing their own confessor, but must confess only to persons appointed by the general.

The same bull contains clauses authorizing even itinerant

[8] Litteræ Apostolicæ, p. 65.

Jesuits to preach and hear confession wherever they may be, if the parochial clergy do not object, and under the condition of obtaining leave from the ordinary, in towns where an ordinary is residing. In this there is little to complain of, if the objections of the parochial clergy be really held valid. Whether it was likely to prove of much weight, must be judged by the past history of the society. The privilege to exercise the art of medicine under certain restrictions is given in another bull of Gregory XIII.[9]; and few things could more add to their influence with the poor. They are next exempted from taking part in any public processions or supplications, thus separating them still farther from the common life and offices of the Church. In the next bull they are permitted to build their houses any where, in direct defiance of privileges conceded to other religious communities[1]. The general is next permitted[2] to alienate any property, as he deems it expedient. Then follows a confirmation by Gregory XIII. of the exemptions from tithes,—of the plenary indulgences granted once in a year,—of the privilege of celebrating mass before daybreak,—of granting degrees by the heads of their colleges, and of publicly lecturing in the universities. Then all the indulgences granted upon visits to other churches may be obtained by Jesuits by praying before their own altar[3]. Then[4] they may be admitted into orders at any period of the year. Then, in full repetition and confirmation of the antecedent prerogatives by Gregory XIII., it is prohibited to any one of any rank or degree, under pain of excommunication, to impugn or contradict any thing in the constitutions or privileges of the society, or upon any pretence whatever, without the permission of the general, to make any remarks upon them ("notationes, declarationes, glossas vel scholia ulla super præmissis facere"), or to put on them any but a literal interpretation; or to read, teach, deliver to others, sell, or keep in their own hands any such glosses or interpretations. Then follows a renewal of the exemption from all official duties, that neither secular nor ecclesiastical authorities may require the aid of a Jesuit to fulfil any office, though there are no other persons on the spot by whom they can be assisted. And this extends to the highest authorities in the state. ("Imperator, reges, et alii sæculares principes.") So that, consistently with this exemption, the English sovereign could not require a Jesuit to undertake the office of sheriff without obtaining the consent of the general at Rome[5]. Still something was wanting to fix the clerical character upon the society as a whole, and thus to depreciate still farther

[9] Litteræ Apostolicæ, p. 76.
[1] Ibid., p. 79.
[2] Ibid., p. 85.
[3] Ibid., p. 99.
[4] Ibid., p. 107.
[5] Ibid., p. 123.

the ecclesiastical orders. This defect is supplied by a bull of Gregory XIII., which allows members of the society, even without being admitted into holy orders, to preach the Word of God publicly in any place; and it is accompanied by an express injunction to all ordinaries not to permit them to be molested[6]. The next important bull is that of Gregory XIII., authorizing the establishment of one of the principal engines and instruments of Jesuitism, their congregations or sodalities. To understand the importance of this privilege, let us suppose that Winchester College, or Eton, or University College in London, or any college in either university, had the power not only of assembling in their chapels the inhabitants of the different parishes around them to hear sermons, and receive the sacraments, independently of the parochial ministers, and without the control of the diocesan, but of forming in those parishes communities and societies of various grades, some of the upper classes, some of artisans, some of students, some of the poor, who should meet in the chapel of the college at stated times to perform an exclusive worship to the Virgin Mary. Let them be encouraged to this by the tutors and authorities of the college ("Lectorum et magistrorum suorum spiritualium cohortationibus ad id accensi"), and by a profusion of indulgences. Let the original sodality be fixed at Rome, and all the other sodalities throughout the world be attached to this ("ab ipsâ primariâ congregatione tanquam membra a capite dependeant"). Let the whole distribution of indulgences, the right of visitation, the creation of statutes, the alteration of them from time to time, according to circumstances, and even the establishment of wholly new laws ("aut alia ex integro condere") be freely and unreservedly ("libere ac licite") vested in the general at Rome; and let there be coupled necessarily with this the spiritual guidance of the individuals comprising these bodies, and the influence exerted over sanguine temperaments by associations for extraordinary devotions. Could our parochial system subsist or be carried on in the midst of such interferences? And should we be surprised at, or regard as apocryphal, and mere ebullitions of party spirit, a series of complaints and remonstrances from the clergy of the country against this intrusion upon their duties? This practice of establishing confraternities is recognized as so important,—it gives such opportunities of extending the influence of Jesuitism over the whole range of society, and attaching all classes to its guidance, without compromising it by admitting them into its secrets,—it enables the skirts of the body to spread over such a vast range, almost unknown and unobserved

[6] Litterræ Apostolicæ, p. 127.

under the disguise of different names, that it is thought worthy of being made the subject of repeated bulls by Gregory XIII. and Sextus V.

As if to cut off all hope of reforming and correcting these radical vices in the constitution of the body, Gregory XIV.[7] solemnly enumerates the various suggestions made to this effect, —suggestions which must occur to every Christian mind,—and after stigmatizing them as calumnies and libels, and as threatening the very being of the society, ("quibus si aditus pateret, universa societatis structura labefactaretur et convelleretur,") he approves and confirms all the most obnoxious portions of the system, ratifies all the indulgences and privileges of his predecessors, and forbids any one, under any pretence, directly or indirectly, to impugn or seek to change a single article, or to propose any addition, diminution, or alteration in the constitution of the body, except by immediate application to the pope through his legate, or to the general himself, whose absolute arbitrary power is the fundamental vice of all. Paul V. follows his example. He also reprobates the attempt to dissolve the society by establishing capitular bodies, and provincial visitors independent of the general, ("nationum collectionem, quæ ingens gloria dictæ societatis est, dissolvere, nec unam, sed multas societates statuere cupientes,") and confirms and establishes its privileges in all their enormity. Alexander VII. grants a plenary indulgence to all who perform the spiritual exercises of Ignatius[8] under the direction of the Jesuits, thus committing to them the spiritual superintendence and direction of souls under a most exciting ordeal. The list may be closed with a bull of Gregory XV.[9] conceding indulgences to the society, on the ground of their peculiar office and duty of catechising and instructing both the young and adults, not only in the rudiments but in the perfection of Christian doctrine, ("inter pia, quæ exercent, opera, peculiare illud institutum,") the duty peculiarly consigned to the three orders of the Christian priesthood by our Lord and the Apostles, but now to be taken from them and committed to a self-elected body, forcing themselves into the labours of others, and withdrawing Christians from their sworn allegiance to the Church, into submission to the general of the Jesuits.

And all these enormous privileges and licences are granted in perpetuity, secured against all possibility of revocation, and by repeated bulls placed beyond the reach even of the papal arm to repeal or modify them. Should such an attempt be made, the general is authorized of himself to re-establish whatever is with-

[7] Litteræ Apostolicæ, p. 147. [8] Ibid., p. 220. [9] Ibid., p. 171.

drawn or altered; and no pope can presume to infringe the rights or correct the extravagances of the society without being met by the denunciations of his predecessors, and paralyzed by their counter authority.

Now in all this we have endeavoured carefully to abstain from any thing which might be disputed or cavilled at. The bulls of the popes here adduced are open to inspection. They form the boast rather than the shame of the Jesuits, and are published by them. And, although there is every reason to believe that some privileges have been suppressed, that, for instance, which excluded any other missionaries but Jesuits from Japan[1], and that reference to the circumstances of the times regulates the publication of others, they form, on the whole, a mass of evidence sufficient in itself to support the conclusion, which nation after nation, and church after church, has proclaimed, that the admission of Jesuitism into a country, even one which acknowledges the pope, is incompatible with its peace, and fatal to its clergy. With these privileges it is not surprising (rather it would be a miracle and a calumny on Jesuits themselves were it otherwise) that wherever they obtained a footing they should embroil themselves with every regular authority in the Church, whether bishops, or parochial clergy, or universities, or colleges. And the reader may be prepared to examine with more candour (for candour is due to an accuser as well as to the accused) the mass of historical documents collected in the well-known work, entitled "Annales de la Société des soi-disans Jésuites,"—documents not made up of vague apprehensions or general criminations, but formal, attested public demonstrations of facts, and coming not from Protestants or heretics, but from countries acknowledging the supremacy of the pope. It is Eustachius du Bellay, Bishop of Paris, who assigns to the parliament of Paris eleven reasons why he concludes that the institution contains many things which seem strange and unreasonable, and which ought not to be tolerated or admitted in the Christian religion, "et qui ne doivent être tolérées ni reçues en la Réligion Chrétienne[2]." It is the Sorbonne, the great theological faculty of France, not any Protestant, which closes its review of the mischiefs threatened by Jesuitism to the Church by these words:—"Itaque his omnibus atque aliis diligenter examinatis et perpensis, hæc societas videtur in negotio *fidei periculosa, pacis ecclesiæ perturbativa, monasticæ religionis eversiva, et magis in destructionem quam in ædificationem.*" It was the assembled clergy of France who, when at last they consented to receive the society, coupled their consent with the peremptory

[1] Annales, vol. ii. p. 745.

[2] Ibid., vol. i. p. 4.

conditions that all its essential privileges, its name, and its independence of the bishops, even its character as a religious order, should be abandoned [3]. It was Melchior Cano, Bishop of the Canaries, who saw in the Jesuits only the forerunners of Antichrist, and as such by every means in his power warned his flock against them [4]. It was the parochial clergy of Paris who made common cause with the Bishop of Paris, the Bishop of Beauvais, the Chancellors of the University, and the religious orders of the Mendicants and the Hospitalists, arguing "idque multis nominibus," that "the Jesuits neither ought nor could be admitted into France, neither as a religious order nor as a college and society [5]."

It is a Romish bishop, De Pontac, Bishop of Bazas, who writes from Rome, dissuading the city of Bourdeaux from placing their college in the hands of the Jesuits; warning them by the too late repentance of Avignon, and many cities in Italy, and prophesying the mischiefs they would introduce [6]. It was St. Charles Borromeo, Archbishop of Milan, who, having first loaded the new society with favour, and chosen his confessor from its body, was compelled on a larger experience to take away from them the direction of his seminaries, and the administration of colleges in his dioceses; and, according to some historians, to prohibit any candidate for the priesthood from studying in a Jesuit college; declaring, that were it in his power, he would take away from them all their institutions of the kind in the world [7]. The list may be followed up by the complaint of the Archbishop of Urbino to Borromeo himself, describing his own treatment from the Jesuits [8]; by the opposition of the Archbishop and Chapter of Toulouse to the establishing of a professed house in that city [9]; by the ordonnances of the Bishop of Poictiers against the attacks of the Jesuits on his episcopal jurisdiction; by the excommunication fulminated against them by the Bishop of Angoulême in 1626 [1], and by the decree of the Bishop of Cornouaille in 1625 [2]; by the complaint of the parish priest of Boussac [3], their aggressions on the property of the religious orders in Germany [4], the complaint of the clergy of Rome in 1564, that the Jesuits would acquire possession of all the benefices and parishes in the city [5]; by their attacks upon the universities of Paris, Douay, Prague, Dillinghen, Louvain, Cracow, Liège, Trèves, Mayence, Pont à Mousson, and others, and these all confirmed by the solemn

[3] Avis de Messieurs du Clergé de France assemblés à Poissy, le 15 Sept. 1561. Annales, vol. i. p. 16.
[4] Imago Pr. Sæc., lib. iv. c. 5.
[5] Annales, vol. i. p. 76. Requête d'Intervention des Curés de Paris.
[6] Annales, p. 112.
[7] Ibid., vol. i. p. 132.
[8] Ibid., vol. i.
[9] Ibid., vol. ii. p. 463.
[1] Ibid., vol. ii. p. 709.
[2] Ibid., vol. iii. p. 29.
[3] Ibid., vol. iii. p. 70.
[4] Ibid., vol. iii. p. 387.
[5] Ibid., vol. iii. p. 386.

appeal of the universities of Salamanca and Seville to the other universities of Spain, to unite in one cause against the introduction of the Jesuits as their common enemy (contre l'ennemi commun), the general scourge of every university (le fléau général de toutes les universités), and the proved corruptors of education by their lax and licentious morality. "If these fathers," they say, "accomplish their design of forcing an entrance among us, we can point out at once its consequence—the abandonment of the universities [6]. Their conduct towards their own episcopacy in England at the end of the sixteenth century is to be found in De Thou. Their repeated defences of their conduct were solemnly condemned by the Archbishop of Paris and thirty-four archbishops and bishops of the faculty of theology, as "tending not only to ruin the episcopal authority, and the sacrament of confirmation, but entirely to overthrow the hierarchy," "mais à renverser entièrement la hiérarchie," and as "full of blasphemies, and propositions seditious and blasphemous." This was followed by the celebrated work of Petrus Aurelius, the Abbé de St. Cyran, in defence of the episcopal authority against the Jesuits, for which he received the thanks of the whole Romish clergy in England in 1633; encountered the persecutions of the Jesuits against not only himself, but the Porte Royale, and was crowned with the reiterated thanks and eulogiums of the assembled clergy of France; and in which work he does not hesitate to speak of the Jesuits in these words: "Episcopi non possunt, aliquid magis episcopis esse velle videntur —in apostolos Christi transfigurari solent—non in ministros, sed in sponsam Christi, in ecclesiam nobilissimam sanctissimamque transfigurantur—disjunctio ac secretio ista arrogans, perniciosa, ominosa, schismatum factionumque turbulentis præit viam—subvertunt ecclesiæ ordinem—inobedientiæ, schismatisque fomitem jam in Catholicorum mentibus præstruitis [7]." Who is it uses the following words respecting the Jesuits on the same occasion: "Your eminence must not be surprised that I speak at such length and so often of the Jesuits. For I see clearly that they are the only persons who would never tolerate a bishop, and that they will always stimulate their penitents to aggressions against them?" It is the envoy of the pope writing to Cardinal Barberini [8]. Who is it that speaks of them as "men who, having been sent into England to aid the pastors of Christ's flock, raised themselves above them, insulted and held up to scorn their authority, and never ceased to vaunt and aggrandize their own power by the aid of novel doctrines, forged by them to combat the ecclesiastical

[6] Annales, vol. iii. p. 367.
[7] Ibid., vol. iii. p. 455, &c.
[8] Ibid., vol. iii. p. 473.

hierarchy and the discipline established by the canons of the Church?" It is the pope's envoy, the Bishop of Chalcedon, writing to the faculty of Theology at Paris to thank them for the condemnation they had passed on the works of the Jesuits, his persecutors [9]. Who, in writing to the same body on the same occasion, thus describes the troubles excited in another part of the Church by the same authors: "Ingentia scandala et dissidia orta sunt in clero cum omnium ecclesiasticorum summa confusione, lætantibus hæreticis, Catholicis vero dolentibus, tam misere discerpi ecclesiam." It is the united voice of the religious orders of Rome in Ireland, solemnly attested by their provincials and the superiors of their communities [1]. We pass over the works of Cellot, the Jesuit, on the ecclesiastical hierarchy, only one of the many works issuing from the order, breathing the same spirit, and developing the theory of their system in relation to the episcopate and the clergy. It was solemnly condemned and prohibited, by whom? By the congregation of the Index at Rome under Urban VIII.[2] We say nothing of acts illustrating this theory, attested by the Archbishop of Sens in 1639 [3], the Archbishop of Rouen in 1640 [4], the Archbishop of Amiens in 1644 [5], the Bishop of Grasse in 1646 [6], by the Bishop of Almansa in 1633 [7], by De Castro, Bishop in the East Indies, under Urban VIII.[8], by the Archbishop of Orleans, the Bishop of Poitiers, the Bishop of Flanders, the Archbishop of Ghent, the Archbishop of Manilla, the Bishop of Honduras, the clergy of Nevers [9], the Archbishop of Mechlin [1], the Bishop of Limoges [2], the Bishop of Castres [3], the Bishop of Chalons [4], the general assembly of the clergy of France in 1650 [5], the Archbishop of Toledo in 1548 [6], Melchior Cano, Bishop of the Canaries, the Bishops of Guadiana, Guadalaxara, and Cusco, the Archbishops of Los Charcas, of the Philippines; of Embrun, Rheims, Tours, and Aix; the Bishops of Saint Pons, Arras, Bayeux, Montpelier, Sénès, Bologne, Rhodez, and Auxerre; closing the list, without exhausting the number, with the names of the Bishop of Paraguay, whom they persecuted nearly to the death, and of the venerable Palafox, Bishop of Angelopolis, whose words to Pope Innocent X. may sum up this head:—"Their power is, at this day [1649], so formidable in the Catholic Church, if it be not reformed—their resources,

[9] Annales, vol. iii. p. 610.
[2] Ibid., vol. iii. p. 715.
[4] Ibid., vol. iii. p. 674.
[6] Ibid., vol. iii. p. 1004.
[8] Ibid., vol. iv. p. 10.
[1] Ibid., vol. iv. p. 651.
[3] Ibid., vol. iv. p. 552.
[5] Ibid., vol. iv. p. 548.
[1] Ibid., vol. iii. p. 611.
[3] Ibid., vol. iii. p. 848.
[5] Ibid., vol. iii. p. 988.
[7] Ibid., vol. vi. p. 8.
[9] Ibid., vol. iv. p. 961.
[2] Ibid., vol. iv. p. 548.
[4] Ibid., vol. iv. p. 554.
[6] Ibid., vol. i. Dissert. p. 79.

honours, and wealth so abundant, that they are more powerful than any authorities whatever, laws, councils, and apostolical constitutions. So that it is necessary for the bishops (at least in these quarters) either to die in the struggle, and to sink and perish in defence of their cause, or to second and aid their efforts: or at least, with the utmost danger, hazard, expense, and inconvenience, and entangled by them in false accusations, to wait for a doubtful issue in a most holy and righteous cause [7].

All these are references to facts. The charges are not vague calumnies, or malignant rumours; but formal statements, founded on official documents, and substantiated by unimpeachable evidence before competent and impartial tribunals. And they are adduced here, not as the groundwork of an accusation against the system of Jesuitism (this must rest upon its internal *à priori* constitution), but as illustrations of its practical working—as a warning not to admit even in the hands of holy men, even with beginnings of harmlessness, a principle and an organization essentially and intrinsically at variance with the polity of the Church. Neither Ignatius in his theory, nor Xavier in his practice, are to be accused of deliberate rebellion against the ministers of the Church. Xavier himself, in his first missionary operations, conducted himself with exemplary deference to them. But the system itself was charged with the elements of faction. And the inevitable result was the laceration and almost destruction of the Church.

But it may be said there still stands over the Jesuit body an authority capable of regulating it,—the authority of the pope. To ourselves, or to the Gallican Church in their old and purer state, before Ultramontanism had succeeded, as at present, in obtaining the control over them through the instrumentality of the Jesuits, this prospect would hold out little consolation. The close and intimate alliance between the Ultramontane power of the pope and the vast secular and spiritual domination of his "paid legion" (the expression is that of a pope himself), is one of the most formidable features in the papal aggressions. But laying aside any views or feelings which may be peculiar to those who deny the papal supremacy, what aid is to be anticipated even by rational and holy-minded Romanists themselves from this supposed check upon the licence and ambition of the Jesuits? If the Jesuit body is thus essential to the very existence of the papacy, as is acknowledged in the bull which restores them, can the pope be really their master? Though under peculiar conjunctures, and when supported by the sovereigns of Europe, one pope bolder than the rest, with the prophecy upon his lips that

[7] Annales, vol. iv. p. 83.

the act would be his death, ("ma questa suppressione mi dara la morte,") yet suppressed them and perished—was that suppression effected? No—they still maintained themselves openly in Russia. Even in the other parts of the world, from which they seemed to withdraw, was the retirement real? The body might disappear, the communities vanish from sight. But, armed with bull upon bull, securing them against any the least revocation of their privileges, authorizing them to restore the body in the fulness and completeness of its organization whenever circumstances should seem favourable, licensed to practices of disguise, practised in all the arts of intrigue, organized as a secret confederacy even in those outlines of the system laid open to the world, familiarized with vast commercial transactions, and accustomed even in their ordinary proceedings to the transfer, commutation, and free employment of enormous funds under the strictest concealment, they bear a charmed life. There is little reason to suppose that even from Ganganelli to Pius VII. in 1814, they were really dead, even where they seemed to be so. The suddenness with which they started to life; the re-assumption of their whole organization, functions, and prerogatives at a moment's notice; the absence of any attempt at that time to modify or correct a system, whose abuses had been so gross and flagrant; and their operations since and before under various disguises and titles, as Brethren of the Faith, Society for the Propagation of the Faith, Christian Brothers, Fraternities of the Sacred Heart, and the like, all would justify a doubt that this disappearance into Russia at the voice of Ganganelli was not a dissolution or death.

It is, in fact, impossible that a power so enormous, so real, so material, so efficient, so intellectual, so energetic, should ever submit itself to be wielded by the weak, effete, inert, and unsubstantial arm of the Roman pontiff. It is not in the nature of man. There is no precedent for it in the history of society. When the power of an ambitious minister has reached a certain height, either the sovereign will be dethroned, or if he be still permitted to bear a title and wear a crown, it will be on one condition—that he becomes a puppet and an idol, and consents to be preserved for the purpose of strengthening the position of his apparent slave and his real tyrant. And so it has been with Jesuitism. Bring history not as the basis of this reasoning (for the reasoning lies far deeper, in the immutable laws and facts of human nature, rather than in disputable statements of circumstances), but to illustrate and confirm it, and what is the result?

They did indeed promise to Paul III. to dedicate themselves to his service, so that whatever he or his successors should enjoin on them, appertaining to the cure of souls or the propagation of

the faith, ("quicquid jusserint ad profectum animarum et fidei propagationem pertinens,") or into whatever provinces they should be sent, they would, without any hesitation or excuse, ("sine ullâ tergiversatione aut excusatione,") instantly feel bound to discharge it as far as lay in their power ("illico exequi teneamur"). No submission could seem more unreserved—no promise more ample. But turn to the Declarations on the Constitutions, and how is this interpreted? First, that the promise of obedience applies only to those who take the fourth vow—to the smallest portion of the society. Secondly, that it applies only to missions ("Tota intentio quarti hujus voti obediendi summo Pontifici, fuit et est circa missiones[8]"). Thirdly, that though the pope may send out, the general may recall. Fourthly, that universal obedience is due to the general, as to Christ himself present among them ("ut in illo Christum velut præsentem agnoscant[9]"). And when obedience to Christ himself clashes with duty to his vicegerent, which is to give way? They need no papal authority to alter or sanction any alteration in their system, for whatever change may be made is declared by popes themselves to be already sanctioned and approved by them ("Quæ postquam mutatæ, alteratæ, seu de novo conditæ fuerint, eo ipso apostolica auctoritate confirmatæ censeantur[1]"). Whatever new houses or colleges may be established, they are already confirmed and authorized. So often as any revocation or limitation of their privileges may issue even from a pope, so often may they all be restored, and replaced by the general in their original plenary force, without requiring any ulterior restitution from the apostolic see[2]: "Quoties emanabunt, toties in pristinum statum reposita et plenariè redintegrata per societatem, illiusque generalem absque eo quod desuper a dictâ sede illorum ulteriori restitutio impetranda est." Whatever indulgences are derived from the pope, they are vested irrevocably in the general, and dispensed by him to the society. And thus armed with independence, what but a humility of temper almost preternatural could preserve the society in submission to the pontiff, whenever such a submission would clash with their own interests or aggrandizement? Thus it was in vain that Paul IV. desired to establish the regular performance of Divine service in their system, and to make the generalship triennial. In vain Pius V. endeavoured to effect the same object, and to abolish certain of their vows. In vain Clement VIII. exhibited the strongest anxiety for the reformation of the society, till, worn out by its intrigues and disturbances, he declared his fear that he

[8] P. 5. c. 3. [9] Supplic. to Paul III.
[1] See the bulls of 1543, 1549, 1582, 1584.
[2] Bull of Gregory XIV., of 1591.

should lose his mind. In vain Paul V. meditated the condemnation of their doctrines, and was met with this memorial from the general:—"If your holiness put this affront upon the society, I will not answer that ten thousand Jesuits will not take up their pens to attack your bull by writings injurious to the holy see[3]." They met the bull of Gregory XV., imposing silence on the controversy respecting the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary, by exhibiting in Spain the figure of St. Thomas seated on an ass, and whipping the saint through the streets. They followed the injunctions of Urban VIII. to abstain from commerce, with so little effect that his injunctions were obliged to be renewed by Clement IX., Clement X., and Clement XI., without their restricting in the slightest degree any of their commercial operations. The Inquisition at Rome condemned the works of the Jesuit Bauni, and the Jesuits immediately reprinted the works in Paris, and both in France and in Spain issued apologies for the doctrines. Innocent X. condemned the idolatrous Chinese rites in 1645, and by a bull of 1646 directed, on pain of excommunication, that a general congregation should be held every nine years: neither was ever attended to: and a few years afterwards the society issued a work proving that the latter bull was a nullity. Alexander VII. again and again condemned books and doctrines published and taught under the auspices of the society; and the only return he met were defences and apologies for them, till he himself complained of the contempt with which his censures were treated. Clement IX. sent bishops, vicars apostolic, and other missionaries into India. The Jesuits attacked them, libelled the bull which declared them delegates of the holy see, cast it torn on the ground, and trampled it under foot; proclaimed that the bishops were heretics, and the sacraments administered by them sacrilegious and null, and the bull surreptitious and invalid. And they excommunicated the Christians who submitted to the vicars apostolic, and even the Bishop of Beryta himself, one of their number. Clement X. attempted to repress this revolt by six or seven decrees: and the Propaganda Society had intelligence of counter-letters sent out to the missionaries by the general, Oliva, directing them to refuse obedience. Innocent XI. ordered the general to withdraw from India eight different Jesuits who were rebelling there against his commands. The Jesuits were not recalled, and their rebellion continued. The same pope prohibited them from receiving any more novices. They caused bills to be affixed to the streets and churches of Paris, in which they invited the people to pray for the conversion of the pope, who had become a Jansenist.

[3] Vide "History of the Jesuits," vol. ii. p. 314.

Alexander VIII. condemned the doctrine of philosophical sin, invented by the society. In Spain, Italy, France, at Douay, Besançon, Poictiers, Pamiers, Sens, and Louvain, they continued as earnest in maintaining the doctrine after the bull as before it. Innocent XII. prohibited, by virtue of the obedience due to the pope, giving the name of Jansenist to any one not convicted by a competent judge: and their open disobedience drew upon them the condemnation of the Inquisition, both in Rome and Spain. When the same pope sent out Maigrot, Bishop of Conon, as his vicar apostolic to China, the Jesuits opposed all his attempts to condemn the idolatrous worship which they had authorized, and endeavoured to deprive him of his charge. They resisted all the decrees of Clement XI. on the same subject. And his legate, Cardinal de Tournon, they outraged by every kind of insult, till he died in the prison of Macao. He published his bull, *Ex illâ die*, in 1715, prohibiting these rites, and obliged the general to send express orders to the superiors in China; but on what authority is it stated that on this, as on another similar occasion, the general sent out at the same time a counter-letter, encouraging them to disobey? It is the secretary of the Propaganda at Rome. Innocent XIII., roused to the enormity of their conduct, was bent upon annihilating the society as well as its missions. He was met by a denial of his power to do so, and died a few weeks after. Benedict XIII. issued a brief confirming the condemnation by his predecessors of the idolatrous worship of Malabar. He was powerless. Clement XII. sent out an apostolic visitor to India. The last words of his envoy were, "I die the victim of the Jesuits." The same pope sent out the Bishop of Halicarnassus to Cochin China, in the same capacity of apostolic visitor; and the treatment he met with from the Jesuits, the insults and injuries heaped upon him, till he was assassinated, and left to die without aid, may be seen in the archives of the Propaganda. The life of Benedict XIV. is one series of conflicts with them, of practices condemned and retained—books censured and republished—bulls issued and despised—reforms attempted and resisted [4].

But beyond all this, there are suspicions of a still more frightful character, and which must force themselves on the attention of readers of history. There must have been some experience, some induction of facts, some internal probability from both the general conduct and the acknowledged casuistry of the Jesuit Society, and from positive evidence also, before the popular voice could stamp them with the crime implied in the following pro-

[4] See, for a fuller Statement, "History of the Jesuits. London: 1816," vol. ii. ch. 38.

verb: "Les Jésuites disent leurs Litanies; nous aurons le siége vacant." "The Jesuits are offering their prayers to be delivered from their enemies (as was their practice when threatened); we shall have the popedom vacant," or, as Ganganelli expressed it, "I have resolved on their suppression, but this suppression will be my death," was not the calumny of an infidel or a Protestant, but the deliberate opinion of the people and of popes of Rome. In how many instances their anticipation was verified, may be seen in a note in the Annales[5]. Of Ganganelli's fate there is an interesting account in the at least impartial work placed at the head of this article, "The Fall of the Jesuits." And it contains in itself the answer to the question proposed, what is the real dependence of the body on the pope? and how far can the pope exercise a salutary control over them? and what is the real obedience to his will which they have professed and exhibited?

This was Ganganelli's state while still deliberating on the suppression, and while the monarchs of Europe were urging him with menaces to resolve on it.

"The Jesuits, on their side, had recourse to similar means; persuasion had failed, and they now resorted to intimidation. It did not require all the perspicacity they possessed to understand the character of Ganganelli: a single day was sufficient to reveal it to them. The day of his accession was destined to be that of their ruin; they expected this, and were resigned to meet the peril. Ganganelli hesitated; and from that instant the society despised an enemy, who, possessing the power and will to annihilate their order, failed to accomplish his purpose. The Jesuits spared no pains to insinuate, by degrees, a feeling of fear into the mind of Clement. At first they represented to him the danger of irritating the sacred college and the nobles: they then alleged the necessity of conciliating the courts of Austria and Sardinia, who honoured the society with their protection; but, as the menaces of Spain, seconded by France, outweighed these minor considerations, it was necessary to resort to arguments of a personal nature, and to intimidate Ganganelli, not on the ground of his political power, but for his life. Surrounded as he was by treachery, he could not resist these impressions: his gaiety of disposition soon disappeared, his health became affected, the signs of extreme uneasiness were stamped upon his features, he courted solitude with fresh ardour, and was more than ever anxious that all the dishes of his table should be prepared by old Francesco, the companion of his early days."—p. 70.

His situation became at length deplorable.

"All pretexts for delay were exhausted; the threats of the Jesuits resounded in his ears with increased boldness; and, in order to act

[5] Vol. iii. p. 353.

more forcibly on his imagination, they assumed a fantastic shape. The approach of his death was announced by a set of impostors, whose predictions were readily believed by the people. Bernardini Beruzzi, a peasant of the village of Valentano, declared herself to be a prophetess, and predicted the vacancy of the Holy See by the mysterious initials P. S. S. V., *Presto sarà sede vacante* (the Holy See will soon be vacant). Although the pope was too enlightened and religious to admit the possibility of divination, he yet felt that it was easy for men to predict events which they themselves could control, and he feared lest poison or the dagger might be employed to aid the accomplishment of these predictions. In the various circles of society, almost in public and aloud, the partisans of the Jesuits accused Clement, heaping reproaches on his name, and even daring to insinuate the probability of his deposition. Insulting images and hideous pictures were put forth, announcing an approaching catastrophe under the form of the vengeance of Providence. Father Ricci, far from feeling any repugnance at the support of such shameless deception, did not even shrink from an interview with the sorceress of Valentano [6]."—p. 82.

At length, the brief of suppression was issued; and all eyes were turned with anxiety to the miserable head of the Romish Church—to the Lord and Master of the society, to whose service it had so solemnly pledged itself, to see (it is a fearful thought) if a body of men priding themselves on an especial pretension to the name and authority and example of the Saviour of mankind, would submit to fall without assassinating their suppressor. What was the issue?

"Excepting a cutaneous eruption, which relieved more than it harmed him, Clement XIV. had never experienced any infirmity; and we may believe the Abbé Georgel, who tells us that Ganganelli's strong constitution seemed to promise him a long career. Nevertheless, in spite of appearances, secret rumours were afloat. At the very time that the pope was seen in the public ceremonies, streets, and churches, in short every where, in the enjoyment of health and strength, the rumour of his death was widely circulated: the pythoness of Valentano announced it with a characteristic obstinacy. These reports were premature; there was too much haste used in preparing the public mind for the event. All on a sudden, at the approach of the holy week in the year 1774, these rumours seemed to be realized. The pope was

[6] "He met her at the house of the advocate Achilli. One has need of proofs for such startling facts; but the impartial reader will have no further doubt when he knows that these accusations are most positively put forth in a very long letter, and one full of details, addressed to Pope Pius VI., by Florida Blanca, and that they are neither denied nor refuted in the answer sent by the pope (February, 1775). Besides, the sorceress of Valentano is fully defended by many pamphlets published at this time."

For similar conduct in the middle of the sixteenth century, see the statement and remonstrance of the Bishop of Chalons, Annal., vol. iii. p. 354.

suddenly confined to his palace, and refused to grant any audience; even the diplomatic body could not obtain access to him. At length, on the 17th of August, the ministers of the great powers were admitted to his presence. The appearance of the pope struck them with surprise; a mere skeleton was before them. Clement marked their astonishment, and, guessing the cause, he declared that his health had never been better. The spectators welcomed this happy presage only from respect; they saw enough to convince them of the truth. From that day, the members of the diplomatic body intimated to their respective courts the prospect of an approaching conclave. How, it is natural to ask, had Clement passed in so short a time from strength to decrepitude—from life to death? After eight months of perfect health, the pope, on rising one day from table, felt an internal shock, followed by great cold. He became alarmed, but by degrees he recovered from his fright, and attributed the sudden sensation he had felt to indigestion. All at once his confidential attendants were struck by alarming symptoms: the voice of the pope, which had before been full and sonorous, was quite lost in a singular hoarseness; an inflammation in his throat compelled him to keep his mouth constantly open; vomitings and feebleness in his limbs rendered it impossible for him to continue his usual long walks, which he always took without fatigue; and his sleep, which was until then habitually deep, was incessantly interrupted by sharp pains. At length, he could no longer get any repose: an entire prostration of strength, the apparent forerunner of dissolution, succeeded suddenly to a degree of even youthful agility and vigour; and the melancholy conviction of an attempt on his life, which he had always feared, soon seized upon Clement, and rendered him strange even to his own eyes. His character changed as by magic; the equability of his temper gave place to caprice, his gentleness to passion, and his naturally easy confidence to continual distrust and suspicion. Poniards and poison were incessantly before his eyes. Sometimes, under the conviction that he had been poisoned, he increased his malady by inefficacious antidotes; at other moments, with the hope of escaping an evil which he imagined not accomplished, he would feed himself with heating dishes, ill prepared by his own hands. His blood became corrupted; the close atmosphere of his apartments, which he would not quit, aggravated the effects of an unwholesome diet. In this disorder of his physical system his moral strength gave way in its turn; there remained no longer any trace of Ganganelli, and his reason even became disordered. He was haunted by phantoms in his sleep; in the silence of the night he started up continually, as dreams of horror excited his imagination, and prostrated himself before a little image of the Madonna, which he had unfastened from his breviary, and before which for forty years two wax tapers had been kept burning night and day. Prostrated thus, in the horrible conviction of his eternal damnation, he exclaimed, while his voice was choked with sobbing, 'Mercy! mercy! I have been compelled. *Compulsus feci! compulsus feci!*' He did not, however, make any retractation in

writing, as has been erroneously affirmed by a writer attached to the society.

"At length, after upwards of six months of torture, Clement saw that his end was approaching. At this moment his reason resumed its sway—his mind rose superior to his infirmities. In the clear possession of his intellect, and tasting the full cup of bitterness and suffering, he approached his end. He desired to speak; a monk whispered a few words in his ear; immediately the words died away upon his lips, and life departed from his body. This took place on September 22, 1774.

"The news of the pope's decease caused little sensation; and the Roman people heard it with indifference. His enemies gave an indecent and unblushing expression to their joy, conveyed in the most infamous satires, which they themselves carried from palace to palace. This conduct was calculated to give rise to strange conjectures, and suspicions were indeed soon excited. The sight of Ganganelli's dead body was quite sufficient to produce this effect; it did not even retain those lineaments which nature leaves to our remains at the moment when death seizes upon them. Several days previous to his death, his bones exfoliated and withered, to use the forcible expression of Caraccioli, like a tree, which, struck at its root, dies away and sheds its bark. The scientific men who were called in to embalm the body, found the features livid, the lips black, the abdomen inflated, the limbs emaciated and covered with violet spots. The size of the heart was much diminished, and all the muscles detached and decomposed in the spine. They filled the body with perfumes and aromatic substances, but nothing could dispel the mephitic exhalations. The entrails burst the vessel in which they were deposited; and when his pontifical robes were taken from his body, a great portion of the skin adhered to them. The hair of his head remained entire upon the velvet pillow upon which it rested, and with the slightest friction all his nails fell off. But enough of this hideous and sickening subject.

"The truth was too evident to admit of being overlooked from private considerations: no one doubted at the time that Ganganelli had met with a violent death. The physicians said little, but the funeral obsequies disclosed sufficient proof of the fact, and all Rome declared that Clement XIV. had perished by the acqua tofana of Peruggia. Denial came too late. The mystery connected with this event has never been entirely removed; some assert that it was not poison, but the fear of poison, that caused the death of Clement; according to others, Ganganelli died from the effects of remorse. Undoubtedly, he suffered from fear, but it had not attacked the springs of life; with respect to his remorse, he abandoned himself to it only during fits of dejection, and for more than a year after the edict of suppression he appeared to be wholly free from such a feeling. Why such tardy regrets? What crime had he committed in the interval? Does remorse admit of postponement? But whatever may be alleged, it is difficult to combat respectable and reputable witnesses. Bernis was

always convinced of the poisoning of Clement; and a testimony from such a quarter is so important, that we shall quote his own words. The following is an extract from the official correspondence of Bernis with the French minister. The cardinal begins with doubt; but his very hesitation, which proves his candour, leads him only the more surely to the discovery of the truth, which he attains step by step. '*August* 28.—Those who judge imprudently, or with malice, see nothing natural in the condition of the pope: reasonings and suspicions are hazarded with the greater facility, as certain atrocities are less rare in this country than in many others. *September* 28.—The nature of the pope's malady, and, above all, the circumstances attending his death, give rise to a common belief that it has not been from natural causes . . . . The physicians who assisted at the opening of the body are cautious in their remarks, and the surgeons speak with less circumspection. It is better to credit the accounts of the former, than to pry into a truth of too afflicting a nature, and which it would, perhaps, be distressing to discover. *October* 26.—When others shall come to know as much as I do, from the certain documents which the late pope communicated to me, the suppression will be deemed very just and very necessary. The circumstances which have preceded, accompanied, and followed the death of the late pope, excite equal horror and compassion . . . . I am now collecting together the true circumstances attending the malady and death of Clement XIV., who, the Vicar of Jesus Christ, prayed, like the Redeemer, for his most implacable enemies; and who carried his conscientiousness so far as scarcely to let escape him the cruel suspicions which preyed upon his mind since the close of the holy week, the period when his malady seized him. The truth cannot be concealed from the king, sad as it may be, which will be recorded in history.'

" We may judge of the force of the cardinal's conviction, which drew from him such severe expressions against men whose unhappy lot he had previously compassionated; but there is another and a more imposing testimony to the fact—that of Pope Pius VI., the successor of Clement XIV.; it is transmitted to us also by Bernis, who speaks in the following cool and dispassionate terms more than three years after the death of Ganganelli. He wrote on the 28th of October, 1777, as follows:—' I know better than any one how far the affection of Pius VI. for the ex-Jesuits extends, but he keeps on terms with them rather than loves them, because fear has greater influence on his mind and heart than friendship . . . . The pope has certain moments of frankness, in which his true sentiments show themselves. I shall never forget three or four effusions of his heart which he betrayed when with me, by which I can judge that he was well aware of the unhappy end of his predecessor, and that he was anxious not to run the same risks.' "—pp. 90—94.

But the Jesuits submitted to their extinction! Not in the least. They never pardoned the ill-fated pontiff for having made

a sacrifice which cost him his life. In all the exasperation of defeat they declared war against Rome, without reflecting for an instant upon the injury which this revolt would occasion to the faith. Instead of submitting, they called in question the validity of the brief. They resisted, and attacked the Holy See, surpassing, it is added, even the school of Voltaire in audacity, and in mocking and insulting a virtuous pope. They retired partly into Prussia and Russia, under the protection of an infidel monarch and most profligate empress, a schismatic, as they professed, from the Church. They procured that the pope's brief should not be received in Russia.

"From this period they maintained a sort of primate or patriarch of the Catholics, the prelate Siestrencewiecz, who was originally a Calvinist, and married; and who became a priest, but of very equivocal orthodoxy. They favoured his nomination to the metropolitan see of Mohilow; and to prove that he was the man of their choice, or at least that they approved of his election, they appointed a Jesuit of the name of Benislawski his coadjutor. Upheld by the authority of the empress, and armed with earnest letters from this princess to the pope, the Jesuit Benislawski set out for Rome, went straight to the Vatican, and, accosting the holy father with a commanding tone, required him to grant the pallium to the Archbishop of Mohilow. Not being able immediately to obtain this favour, he declared that, if he had to spend his life in the ante-chamber of the pope, he would never quit it until he was satisfied on every point. His demand was complied with, and very shortly a nuncio was despatched to St. Petersburgh. From that moment Pius VI., who was disposed to favour the Jesuits, gave way to his inclination, and openly maintained the suppression of the society, while he favoured their growth in Russia, condemning and encouraging them at the same time. In 1782 the fathers of Polotzk met in congregation, and elected a vicar, who governed the college for two years. In time they grew tired of such expedients, and the vicar took the name of General of the Order. And yet the brief of Clement XIV. existed, together with the anomaly of a religious order in rebellion against the holy father, yet approved by him in secret,—upheld by all the powers separated from Rome, against those powers who remained in her communion,—and, more extraordinary still, the papacy at war with itself!

"The nursery of the society was kept up in White Russia, and owed much to a man whose great ability resembled the now extinct Jesuits of former times, a real successor of Aquaviva and Laynez. This father, whose name was Grouber, and who was made general of his order, kept within the bounds of a politic prudence. The ardent and indiscreet zeal for proselyting, which discovered itself at a later period, led to the expulsion of the society from the kingdom which had afforded them a constant asylum; but this settlement in the north was no longer needful for them. Pius VII. relieved them from their degradation, and the bull of this pope (*Sollicitudo omnium ecclesiarum*), dated the 7th of August,

1814, revoking the brief of Ganganelli, formally set it aside, and re-established the Society of Jesus throughout the world!"

And in the mean while had they departed from Europe? or, as Cardinal Bernis had warned his master, did they continue in secret, and disguised by new names, to carry on the same society with the same principles? In 1805, the French minister, Portalis, made a formal report to the Council of State on the subject of certain religious communities which had established themselves in France under the name of "Societies of the Sacred Heart," "Victims of the Love of God," "Society of Fathers of the Faith," "Paccanaristes," and others. The first have been long since identified as closely connected with the Jesuit body. The two last Portalis distinctly affirms to be only the Jesuits in another name. They were compelled to alter their title and their dress slightly while in Prussia and Russia, until the pontificate of Pius VI., who, at the solicitation of the emperor, authorized them to resume their original establishments, though under the condition that they should not exist except in Russia[7]. To these we may now add another body, "The Christian Brothers," who have been appended, as it were, to the original organization of the Jesuit body, for the purpose of extending their education to the lower orders; but of whom none but the superiors (we speak of the state of things some few years since) were aware that any connexion existed between themselves and the Jesuits. This is not the place to dwell upon this superficially fascinating institution, full of apparent good, and yet pregnant with the seeds of incalculable mischief. But those who may be captivated with its exterior, and candidly alive to its excellences, must never forget that it is a branch of Jesuitism.

But we must turn to a distinct branch of the considerations which beset the history of Jesuitism—its relation to the state. Statesmen, at least politicians calling themselves statesmen, may think little of its aggressions upon the ecclesiastical polity, and Gallio-like care nothing for these things, as if they were mere questions of words, and controversies on abstractions. And Churchmen, so-called, who will not realize their duty to the civil power, may think as little of a seemingly spiritual triumph over a secular authority. But if, separately, each in his own sphere may be induced to look more narrowly into the constitution of this marvellous instrument for the acquisition of power, we may be spared in future from hearing those rash and thoughtless eulogiums upon its character, which have startled the English mind, even from the walls of parliament.

[7] Histoire Abrégée des Jésuites, vol. ii. p. 372.

Let us imagine a case. Conceive that the Emperor of Russia laid claim to the sovereignty of the British empire—that on some pretence or other, moral or religious, or mixed of both, he put forward a right to interfere with the prerogatives of the English crown—that he made the validity of its succession to depend on his will, the allegiance of its subjects on his voice, the friendship of foreign states on his abstinence from any exhortation to open war—that a long series of open hostilities had been waged against us upon these very grounds—that, notwithstanding occasional and evasive professions of modifying or withdrawing such pretensions on the part of individual subjects belonging to him, he himself had never abandoned an iota of his claims—that, on the contrary, his adherents were becoming each day more peremptory in their demands, and more unreserved in their arguments in its behalf—imagine then that a body of men rose up in Russia, and placed themselves under the command of a Prince Kutusoff, or a Count Alexander, with the avowed object of maintaining and spreading through the world, and especially in the heart of England, this doctrine of the Russian prerogative. Let them come under disguises and false names, disseminate themselves through the country, act secretly, establish correspondents all over the world, plant schools where they may rear up the young under their influence and in their principles, obtain the command over the clergy, penetrate into private families, insinuate themselves into the ears of princes, become the confessors and spiritual directors of wives and mothers, exercise a sway from the highest to the lowest classes, in the pettiest as in the most momentous acts, over the souls of thousands. Let the result of this be in a few years successive outbreaks of treason, rebellion, attempts at regicide, foreign invasions, and horrible conflicts. Let these facts be formally proved and substantiated, and be confirmed by similar outbreaks in neighbouring countries, wherever these emissaries have gained a footing. Let public indignation and the necessity of the state expel them from every other kingdom. Let England follow the example. Let the emperor himself, at last worn out with remonstrances, and alarmed at the excesses and crimes of his own supporters, disband and suppress them. Let a short time elapse, and his successor once more call them into life, reorganize them on the same principles, restore every one of their powers and privileges, arm them with the same weapons, and send them forth into England once more upon the same mission. And then imagine that the legislature and the crown, paralyzed by some past concessions to popular licence, or seduced by empty professions of innocent intentions, or incapable of discriminating falsehood from truth, where, like Pilate, they have learnt to ask

but one sneering question, "What is truth?" or led away by some vague enthusiastic dreams of ardent minds, who have never examined into history, or separated between the heroism of individuals and the vices of the system which they subserve—with all experience crying out to warn them, and the laws which they have themselves enacted staring them in the face—that they should yet permit once more these emissaries to spread themselves through the country, to become masters of property, to move about in it under disguise, to assemble themselves in secret confederacies, to obtain again in the most disturbed and disloyal and precarious portion of the empire the control over the education of the peasantry and of the clergy, and through them of a whole hierarchy arrayed openly against the laws of the empire, —and then, when demand is made that the statutes they themselves enacted should be enforced, and safeguards they themselves created should be put in use, and the country be saved by speedy precaution from a repetition of the same troubles by the same confederacy, the answer given should be, that times are changed, that the constitution of England no longer permits us to expel the emissaries of a foreign power, bent on subverting its laws and enslaving its liberties; that in the times of Elizabeth and James the Jesuits might have been crushed and exterminated, but that now we must submit to the risk; that to save ourselves from such imminent peril is incompatible with the principles of toleration.

Is the unity and integrity of the empire, or of any political society, a portion of its very life and essence? Is this compatible with the exercise of a foreign jurisdiction and prerogative over the persons, property, and consciences of its subjects? Does it not depend on the recognition of some one supreme authority within the empire, beyond which there is no appeal, from which all others are derived, to which they are all responsible? Has it not been for this, as for national existence itself, that wars after wars have been waged, and struggles carried on, and laws created? And is it then a matter of no moment—a mere speculative question—a squabble, as it has been termed, of monks—or a romantic theory of self-denial and enthusiasm, that the subjects of a foreign monarch, pledged to him by the most solemn vows and obligations wholly and unreservedly, beyond any degree of vassalage that ever placed a serf at the foot of his lord, and bent upon reducing England to his power, should be allowed to penetrate into and take up their position in the heart of the country; with this excuse only, that their master is not a crowned head, but only the general of an army—that their weapons are not as yet open instruments of violence, but only plausible artifices and secret intrigues; and

their motive not a secular object, but only that which, unregulated and misapplied, stimulates the most reckless fanaticism, and emboldens men to the most enormous crimes—a false religion?

But, it will be said, Jesuitism is but a form of opinion, a mere speculation; and a speculation, from its very extravagance, unsuited to the liberalism of the present day, and incapable of making progress. Let us not deceive ourselves. It is not an opinion—but an army; not a speculation—but a warfare; and a warfare bent—directly and unremittingly, and with the most formidable of all weapons, stratagem and falsehood—against the civil powers of the earth.

The same ambition which reared up the ultramontane doctrine of the independence of the pope upon councils, and of his despotic authority over bishops, reared up also the other branch of the same theory, his power over kings. Monarchs and their Divine delegation from Heaven presented even a stronger obstacle to the dream of an universal empire placed at the feet of an individual at Rome, than the independence of the Episcopate. It was therefore necessary to be removed; and Jesuitism undertook to remove it. For this purpose they asserted in their works the theory, in its fullest extravagance, of the supremacy of the spiritual power over the temporal. At the same time, to save themselves from the difficulty of maintaining the doctrine in its form most obnoxious to kings and most offensive to reason, they gave up to a certain extent the direct power of the pope over temporals, and confined his claim to the indirect, *in ordine ad spiritualia*. And thus at the present day they boldly exclaim against the injustice of charging them with the maintenance of an obsolete and absurd doctrine, reserving to themselves an equally extensive dominion through the thousand openings and channels by which temporal things exert indirectly an influence on spiritual. And whenever a touchstone is to be applied to their real opinions on this subject, if any touchstone can extort them, it must be framed to test the theory, not of a direct, but of an indirect power. Secondly, it was necessary to strip the civil authority of all its divine character, to regard it solely as a conventional arrangement, a creature of man, which society might constitute, and, having constituted, might modify and destroy at their will. Hence there is no extravagance of radicalism which may not find its counterpart in the political theories of Jesuit writers—not one or two, but the general authorized, applauded interpreters of the society. And hence the phenomenon apparently so inexplicable, that the closest alliance can subsist between the extremest forms of liberalism in politics and the most bigoted Romanism; and that, where Romanism now works, it works often with democratical associates. Thirdly,

it was necessary to create in the same manner, and, as it were, by the same gift and consecration from the Church, a temporal sovereignty which might at once place itself over the head of ordinary monarchs, possessing, like them, subjects, and domains, and revenues, and arms, and laws, and judges, wholly distinct from those of separate states. Such a sovereign is the General of the Jesuits. Bull after bull invests him with the power of defending his society against the attacks or molestations of any person whatever—"a quibuscunque personis, tam secularibus quam ecclesiasticis, quâcunque auctoritate et superioritate fungentibus;" and of defending it in any way—"per sententias, censuras, aliaque juris et facti opportuna remedia compescendo[8]." His subjects, whether Spaniards, or Portuguese, or French, or English, swear to him an allegiance beyond any which any earthly monarch ever possessed. They are to regard their general, not merely as holding a commission from the pope, or even from the Almighty, but as his plenipotentiary upon earth, his *locum tenens*, as Christ Himself—(locum Dei tenenti, in eo Christum veluti præsentem agnoscant venerenturque). The obedience they promise is to be blind—obedientia cæca. It extends to all things, even those not obligatory—in omnibus etiam non obligatoriis. Its perfection is to be in his hand as a walking-stick, or as the limb of a dead body, without a thought or power of resistance. It is to be irrespective of the laws and tribunals of any other potentate. It is to try its subjects even as Abraham was tried. Consequently it is obligatory even to sin—superiores possunt obligare ad peccatum, in virtute obedientiæ, quando id multum conveniat[9]. It abandons to their superiors even the thoughts of the heart. The whole soul is to be laid open, that it may be moved and played upon with the same facility and unerring result as the keys of an instrument. And this obedience is secured by arts which other monarchs dare not use, lest they should bring upon themselves the indignation of outraged humanity,—by an espionage which besieges every member of the body on every side, which requires that all his errors and defects, and every thing observed in him, be made known to his superiors by any one who has perceived or heard them out of the confessional; and, as may be seen hereafter, even this last reserve and obstacle is capable of being removed —"ut omnes errores et defectus ipsius et res quæcunque, quæ notatæ in eo et observatæ fuerint, superioribus per quemvis, qui extra confessionem eas acceperit, manifestentur." It allows no letters to be written or received, except with the leave and through the hand of the superior, by whom they may be retained. In

[8] Bull of Gregory XIII. 1593.

[9] Index General, p. 605.

other words, the last exercise of the prerogative, never to be used by an English monarch except in cases of the utmost state necessity, and guarded against with the severest jealousy, is the ordinary privilege of the superior of a Jesuit institution. "Literæ scribi non debent, nisi cum licentia superioris, nec accipi nisi per ipsum. Et superior potest eas retinere[1]." It plants even by the officers a private as well as an official spy, whose duty it is regularly to communicate to the general every detail of his conduct. To prevent the necessity of openly breaking the seal of confession, besides the confessional there is established another tribunal of the superiors, before which it is enjoined to all the members to lay open their most secret thoughts. And though there is a law forbidding Jesuit confessors to make use of their knowledge[2], it is carefully and curiously expressed in such a manner as to lay the injunction open to the dispensations suggested by the theory of probabilism—"some doctors have taught the contrary,"—"non desunt doctores, qui notitiâ per confessionem habitâ salvo sacramenti sigillo confessariis uti nonnunquam licere sentiant." And the whole theory of the authority of the general—his avowed need of knowing most minutely the character and acts of every individual—his unlimited power of dispensation and absolution from all ecclesiastical censures—and, as confirmatory of these anticipations, facts which, though they cannot be used in argument, are yet sufficiently substantiated for credibility—all lead to the conclusion, that even the seal of confession is not likely to be a bar to the *omniscience* of the ruler of the society. From very different sources it has been stated that the confessions are registered and preserved. And the King of Spain is said to have detached Maria Theresa from the society, by sending to her her own general confession, which was discovered in a Jesuit college in Spain.

Nor is the general powerless to enforce obedience. He can administer discipline, require and enforce submission, exercise the privileges of the Inquisition, eject the disobedient member, stripped of all that he possessed, or all that he gave to the society; and the return of which, if it be still in existence, depends upon the will of the general. Or, if the rebellious subject has fled from his prison, he may be dragged back as an apostate, incarcerated, and punished in any way, even by the intervention of the secular arm. There is no appeal to any laws that protect the citizen,—no habeas corpus,—no trial by jury,—no judicial tribunal. The will of the general is all in all.

And this universal monarch is possessed also of revenues and

[1] Index General, p. 571.

[2] Ordinat. General. cap. ii. s. 14.

domains. Paraguay was their first attempt to found a separate kingdom, in defiance of the authority of its lawful sovereign. This missionary establishment, admirably planned and holily conducted—that is, if Christian education be the training of human beings in the helplessness and dependence of infancy—possessed an army of sixty thousand men, parochial regiments of infantry and cavalry, which, under the command of a Jesuit generalissimo, and of Jesuit colonels, lieutenants, and general officers, went through their exercises every Sunday after vespers. It had a commerce amounting to more than a million of piasters per annum, of which the half was clear profit. It excluded not only strangers, but even the bishop of the province, from holding communication with its district; and it ended by waging open war against the armies of Spain and Portugal. "I found the Jesuits," says the good Bishop Palafox, speaking of another district, "possessed of nearly all the wealth and opulence of the provinces of Spanish America. Two of their colleges possess at present nearly 300,000 sheep, without reckoning other cattle. In Mexico they have six of the largest sugar refineries, though only ten colleges. One of these is valued on an average at half a million of dollars; and some even amount nearly to a million. Some bring in a hundred thousand dollars per annum. They have farm districts—farms of upwards of twenty or thirty miles in extent—mines of silver, public magazines, markets, shops, resources of trade of every kind, from high to low, even butcheries [3]." In China they had three banks, which lent money at interest, from which, on ordinary calculation, they must have derived a revenue of 180,000 francs [4], besides a commerce of other kinds—in pearls, diamonds, stuffs, wines, tobacco, sugar, and other commodities [5]. In Martinique the failure of La Valette betrayed commercial speculations, the profits of which were calculated in France by millions of francs, all of which was merged in the general revenue of the society, placed at the disposal of the general. They had obtained establishments and property in Italy, Portugal, France, Germany, Ireland, England, Transylvania, Livonia, Lithuania, Prussia, Bavaria, Hungary, Moravia, Poland, Ethiopia, Abyssinia, Malabar, Persia, Turkey, Japan, China, Canada, Brazil, Mexico, Paraguay, and Peru. And their movements in all these regions, in the words of one of their own generals, were governed without the slightest resistance, and in the profoundest secrecy, by a single hand at Rome. "From this chamber where we now are," he observed to the Duc de Brancas, "I govern not only Paris, but

[3] 1 Lett. de Dom. Jean de Palafox au Pape Innocent X., 1647.
[4] Mém. des Missions Etrang., p. 67.
[5] Anecdotes de la Chine, vol. ii. pp. 5. 16.

China,—not only China, but the whole world,—without any one knowing how it is done!" And the rapidity of their growth was as formidable as its extent. In 1540, when Paul III. established them by his bull, they were only in number 10. In 1545 they were still only 80. In that year they had only 10 houses. But in 1549 they had already 2 provinces and 22 houses; and at the death of Ignatius, in 1556, they had 12 great provinces. In 1608 Ribadeneira reckoned 29 provinces and 2 vice-provinces, 21 houses of profession, 293 colleges, 33 houses of probation, 93 of residence, and 10,580 Jesuits. In 1670 they had 35 provinces, 2 vice-provinces, 33 professed houses, 568 colleges, 48 houses of probation, 88 seminaries, 160 residences, and 106 missions; and in all there were 17,655 Jesuits, of whom 7870 were priests. And at last, according to the calculation of the Jesuit Jouvenci in 1710 they had 24 professed houses, 59 houses of probation, 340 residences, 612 colleges, 200 missions, 157 seminaries and boarding-schools, and 19,090 Jesuits[6].

In addition to this class of forces, encamped, or to be encamped and garrisoned on every kingdom on the globe, the general may now count on the secular clergy of Rome, especially in France and in Ireland, who, from being the strong advocates of the Gallican liberties, have now, partly by the artifices of the Jesuits in obtaining the command of their education, partly by the dread of the seemingly opposite faction of irreligion, thrown themselves into the arms of the Jesuits; so that now Romanism itself is almost identical with Jesuitism. Beyond this are the children of all classes, especially the higher, whom they rear in their schools, imbue with their maxims, and attach with every art to their interest. Beyond this are various bodies, such as the Christian brothers, whom they command and direct, without their arm being seen. Beyond these, the immense numbers of weak, or troubled, or excited consciences, which they control, fascinate, and govern through the confessional. Beyond this, a number of other persons, of various classes, not absolutely enrolled in the body, but attached to it by various degrees of dependence, though they still remain in the world, and are distinguishable by no outward marks. Of the existence of such members there can now no longer be a doubt. Such are the subjects and the forces of the king of the Jesuits.

The arms with which they carry on their warfare are legitimated, and almost consecrated, as it were, by their own moral writers. There is the favour and interest of great men—of the rich and the noble. The constitutions openly direct attention to

[6] Dissertation Analyt., p. 26.

this, again and again[7]. There is the unrestricted knowledge of the passions, vices, past life, and minutest acts of every individual who can be brought within their influence. There is the fear and terror excited even in the minds of the most powerful of Romanists—sovereigns and popes—by the invisible presence of such an enormous mass of fanatical enthusiasm, penetrating into every portion of society, and ready to explode at the will of a foreign leader, the avowed antagonist of their authority. Even Henry IV. confessed that he quailed beneath it. There is the licensed use of the whole magazine of spiritual terrors and censures placed in the hands of the society by the pope himself. There is the power of calling into action any secular arm at their disposal to defend their privileges. There is an organization of consummate flexibility and unerring certainty, ramifying through every class of society, and into every country, and answering the touch of one hand with the most implicit obedience. There is a zeal let loose by a most lax but an authorized casuistry, the work not of any single writer, but of author upon author, approved and published, edition on edition, and defended pertinaciously against the most solemn condemnations of the Church,—a casuistry which releases the conscience from all moral obligations that embarrass it, and gives full scope to the passions, and which is fastened on the society, by its own acts, as its peculiar creation, property, and instrument. Let reference once more be made to that vast collection of unimpeachable documentary evidence contained in the Annales, and to the repeated censures and condemnations of the casuistry of Jesuit writers, by parliaments, universities, bishops, and popes, all of them Romish. Let it be remembered that upwards of 2000 extracts were verified publicly before the parliament of Paris, without resting on the sources from which Pascal drew his provincial letters. Add to this that the direction of the conscience is one of the first objects of the society; that to obtain favour with all classes, and draw crowds to their pulpits and confessionals, is repeatedly held forth in their statutes as a necessary aim; that to obtain this influence there is need of a relaxed discipline, and an accommodating morality; that to adapt itself to the varieties of human intellect, a bold sceptical religious doctrine is required; that to give full play to the means of defence and offence in the warfare they undertake, there must be a licence to employ any means, and to justify those means by the end, whether they be falsehood, or evasion, or calumny, or assassination, or regicide; that there must be uniformity of opinion in the society to preserve its solidity, and, at the same time,

[7] V. Index Generalis, Magnates, p. 78.

plausibility and versatility, to ensure that power of adaptation to circumstances which is avowedly reserved to the general. Let it be then seen that the doctrine of probabilism, or the credibility of any opinion which has been maintained by an eminent doctor, and the liberty of following it, even against our own conscience, ensures the pliability; and that a supply of such doctors maintaining the most monstrous tenets was a necessary accompaniment to it. Let it then be remembered that every publication of the society is placed under a severe and secret police; that no book, or pamphlet, or even handbill, may be published without the permission of the general; that those who print without permission, and under a borrowed name, are subjected even to corporal punishment; that the revisors in the provinces appointed by the general are ordered to send their observations to Rome, and to wait the orders of the general; that if after correction the author makes any alterations, he will be severely punished; that these punishments extend to accomplices and even to superiors; and that even translations may not be published without permission of the general[8]. Lastly, let search be made through the whole list of condemned writers for any one who has been censured by the society, or punished, or expelled—who has not rather been republished again and again—("Busembaum," the worst to the extent of fifty editions)—and apologized for in the face of ecclesiastical authorities. Let all these things be candidly weighed, the *à priori* expectations with the positive evidence of fact; and then let the reader, however anxious to cast a veil over the crimes of Jesuit casuistry, lay his hand upon his heart and pronounce the society innocent of its enormities[9].

With a legion thus armed and constituted, recruited by means of an exciting and overwhelming ordeal, the spiritual exercises of Ignatius, not only from zealous and ardent, but from ill-regulated or fanatical minds, burdened with the conscience of past sins—their whole nature placed abjectly at the disposal of

[8] The reference to the constitutions enforcing these rules may be seen in Monclar's "Compte Rendu," p. 234.

[9] And if any, not familiar with these writings, imagine that a few only are culpable, and that the whole body is not implicated in their errors, let them examine into the accuracy of the following statement given in the "Histoire Abrégée," vol. ii. p. 287. The number of Jesuit writers authoritatively condemned or to be condemned for immorality is as follows:—

On the subject of Probabilism	56	On Falsehood and Perjury	29
On Philosophical Sin	40	On the corruption of Judges	5
On Simony	14	On Theft	34
On Blasphemy	5	On Homicide	36
On Sacrilege	2	On Parricide	5
On Sorcery	5	On Suicide	2
On Irreligion and Idolatry	37	On Regicide	75
On Adultery and similar Sins	14		

another—their hopes and zeal inflamed with the present grandeur of their society, or the promised glories of Heaven—their consciences released from every scruple—their wildest dreams of enthusiasm let loose by the magic words, "to the greater glory of God," *ad majorem Dei gloriam*—taught to regard kings as their enemies, and nations as their property—authorized to disseminate themselves throughout society in every disguise—fascinated by the interest of intrigue—supplied with every variety of talent to meet every exigency, the Jesuits who are licensed by the general (for such only are wisely permitted to engage in political affairs) carried on their warfare against the civil government of the world. And what is their history?—In 1550 they distract Venice. In 1578 they intrigue in Portugal to deprive the Queen of the regency. In 1580 they attempt an insurrection in England. In 1581 they are detected in a conspiracy in Germany. In 1584 they are charged with the assassination of the Prince of Orange. In 1589 they become the animating soul of the League. In 1593 and 1594 five conspiracies against Elizabeth in England are brought home to them. At the same period, they are charged with instigating the assassination of Henry IV. by Barrière. In the same year, they make another attempt on the life of Henry IV. by Jean Chatel. In 1595 they excite a revolt at Riga. In 1597 they are involved in another plot against Elizabeth. In 1598 and 1599 they pay and admit to confession and the Holy Communion assassins to destroy Prince Maurice of Nassau. At the same period, they excite revolts against the sovereign authority in Styria, in Carinthia, in Bavaria, in Transylvania, in Poland, and in Sweden. 1605 is the date of the Gunpowder Plot, and in the same year they involve Russia in war in the cause of the false Demetrius. About the same time they excite troubles at Venice, Dantzic, Thorn, Genoa, Bohemia, and Louvain. In 1610 they are charged as accomplices in the assassination of Henry IV. by Ravaillac. In 1615, and the following years, they distract, by their intrigues and struggles, the universities and the clergy of France. In 1622, 1626, and 1634, they kindle a civil war in Poland. In 1625 they attack Louis XIII. In 1643 they are expelled from the schools of Milan by Borromeo. In 1644, and following years, they destroy the peace of the Church, and carry on a war against its most holy members in France, to the infinite confusion both of the state and the Church, by their doctrines of Molinism and their calumnies of Jansenism—a struggle, let it be remembered, not, as it may sound to some, of abstract theological opinions, but deeply real and practical—a struggle to extirpate from the Church in France the true Catholic doctrines which it had still

firmly, though inconsistently, preserved from the grasp of the papacy, and to raise the pope as sole despot of the Church on the ruins of primitive antiquity, of the episcopacy, and of councils. But the list is not yet closed. In 1688 they advise James to his destruction. In 1722 they conspire in China to dethrone the emperor. In 1725 Peter the Great is compelled by their intrigues to banish them from Russia. In 1728 and 1751 they are expelled from the office of public education. In 1739 they conspire for the throne of Tonquin. In 1759 they join in the plot for the assassination of the King of Portugal. This catalogue might be far extended, and include the ruin of the Bourbon dynasty in France; but it is enough to have taken one which has been already given by others [1].

And when it is argued that these charges are all calumnies—the inventions of infidel philosophers, of ungodly monarchs, of jealous rivals, or violent Protestants, let it be remembered what monarchs have been the most strenuous supporters of the order; —Louis XIV., Frederick of Prussia, Catherine of Russia. To whom do the defenders of the system appeal for testimonials of its value [2]? To infidel philosophers themselves. Think of the singular uniformity prevailing in the judgment of the most remote countries, and most opposite characters! Let it be asked how, on any ordinary ground of probability, except the reality of the fact, it is possible to account for the phenomenon exhibited in the following table.

From the year 1555 to 1773, by heathen as well as by Christian sovereigns, by Romish far more than by Protestant states, they were expelled from the following places, not before, but after trial of their conduct. The table is given in the "Histoire Abrégée," vol. ii. p. 288, and it stands thus:—

Sarragossa	1555	The whole of France	1594
The Valteline	1566	Holland	1596
Vienna	1568	Tournon	1597
Avignon	1570	Bearn	1597
Antwerp	1578	England	1601
Segovia	1578		1604
Portugal	1578	Dantzic and Thorn	1606
England	1579	Venice	1606
	1581		1612
	1586	Ameera, in Japan	1613
Japan	1587	Bohemia	1618
Hungary and Transylvania	1588	Moravia	1619
Bordeaux	1589	Naples	1622

[1] Histoire Abrégée, vol. ii. p. 283.
[2] See "Reply to Dallas, Defence of the Jesuits," vol. i. p. 272.

The Netherlands	1622	France	1762
China and India	1622	Spain	1767
Malta	1634	The Sicilies	1767
Russia	1676, 1723	Parma	1768
		Malta	1768
Savoy	1729	Rome and the whole of Christendom	1773
Portugal	1759		

To the list may be added their last expulsion from Russia by the Emperor Alexander in 1816; the remonstrances against their restoration in 1814 by Portugal, Austria, Naples, and Switzerland[3]; their recent expulsion from the Continent; and to the present generation of politicians that which cannot be evaded, the formal precautions against their re-establishment in England when the disabilities of the Romanists were removed. Were the authors of that bill ultra-Protestant enemies of Rome, or infidel philosophers, or ignorant of history? Did they, in placing the practical exclusion of the Jesuits from England among the few safeguards to a most hazardous measure, follow merely the idle calumnies of forgotten days, and throw out the precaution to delude a vulgar mob, without a thought of the necessity of ensuring its execution? Or did they really believe that the history of Jesuitism was not a falsehood, its accusers not calumniators, its system not compatible with the peace of the Church, the integrity of the realm, or the liberty of the people? And one more question may be asked—if, in bribing England to the reception of their measure by such a condition, they honestly acknowledged its necessity, what have they done since to redeem their pledge? How comes it, that to ask at this day for an inquiry into the progress of Jesuitism in this empire, and an enforcement of the law against it, would be deemed a mockery?

We must now conclude.

The foregoing remarks are not meant as a sketch of the history of Jesuitism, or a full development of its principles and tendencies; far from it. But they have been made in the hope of arresting, if only one or two minds, and inducing them to examine before they panegyrize. In every panegyric (however guarded) there is great danger. It will be seized on, and employed without scruple, to answer ends that the author never contemplated. But in expressions of warm unreserved admiration and sympathy for Jesuits, in contemptuous condemnation of those who have felt it their duty thoughtfully and deliberately to protest against the system, there is incalculable evil.

Imagine that a hundredth part of the evidence merely hinted

[3] Histoire Abrégée, vol. ii. p. 388.

at in these pages, but offered to investigation in numerous accessible works, were brought against the conduct of any individual, and who would dare to set it aside as undeserving consideration, or receive the accused party with open arms as indisputably a calumniated innocent? English justice would demand that he should not even now be pronounced guilty until his cause had been heard; but it would demand also that he should be put upon his trial. This is all that we ask for Jesuitism. Let it be tried. Let it not be acquitted, any more than condemned, without the cause being heard.

And let the inquirer add to the two questions already suggested in regard to its collision with the divine ecclesiastical polity, and the divine supremacy of states, others of a more ethical nature. What is the moral bearing of a system in the hands of men, which rests on two exclusive principles—the omnipotence of an individual ruler, and the blind obedience of unresisting subjects? What must be the effect of such arbitrary unlimited power on the ruler, and of such absolute unthinking subjection on the ruled? How is this absorption and concentration of all duties in the one duty of obedience to an individual consistent with the perfection or development of human nature, which is a constitution of many affections and many principles, directed to many different objects, and intended to comprehend them all? What is the effect of stripping and laying bare all the secret movements of the heart before a fellow-creature, as if some curious hand should tear away the integuments of the skin, and set before us in our daily walks the naked carcass, the throbbing veins, the raw muscles, the whole quivering, bloody, loathed anatomy of man's miserable animal frame, instead of that decent mantle which a merciful Maker has thrown over the infirmities of the flesh? Obedience is indeed a virtue—obedience to God as supreme, and to man as His delegate and steward. But is it any longer a virtue, when separated from thoughtfulness and self-command? Is it not rather a vice, when it abdicates the first function of a reasonable being, the exercise of reason? Is it not actual rebellion against God, when paid, not to His apparent minister, but to a human authority, self-created and chosen by our own self-will? Is it not idolatry to behold and reverence Christ, not in the form which he has assumed, but in the person of the general of the Jesuits? Again; what must be the moral effect of living in an atmosphere of espionage, distrusting and distrusted, or of being severed from home, and country, and Church, and arrayed in rivalry and opposition against them? How will the honesty and integrity of Christian simplicity be twisted and corrupted by a multitude of uncertain engagements, of vows doubtful in their

validity, voidable by dispensations, perplexed with all the chicanery of a policy which has but one object—to gain and ensure to itself the services of a slave? Or how will humility consist with the pretensions of an exclusive society, surrounded with the intoxicating flatteries of the world? Is it possible to preserve, unseared and uncorrupted, a conscience daily involved, as its appointed task, in the compromises and hypotheses of a subtle casuistry? Will a bold and upright spirit be nurtured in a body, which guards its laws, its movements, its privileges, and its ends secret from the world—which does not allow even its own members to see all the obligations they contract, or the deeds to which they may be pledged—which, having once been rejected from a country, resolves and is compelled to insinuate itself again under assumed pretences and with a borrowed name? What must be the effect of that ambiguous character, which is neither secular nor clerical, which releases itself from secular obligations by pleading religious, and from religious by pleading secular, and thus unites the privileges of both without the restrictions of either? Or, if the excellence and safety and happiness of man depend on his moving at every step under the consciousness and the limitations of fixed external laws, and those laws laid down by God, what is not to be feared from letting the mind loose from all these restraints by recognizing only one object as imperatively binding, the pursuit of the glory of God, and then unfixing and unsettling even this by adding "to the greater glory," "ad majorem Dei gloriam," leaving it to man to decide what most contributes to this end, not by adhering rigidly to the positive institutions of God Himself, but by forming a human calculation and balance of expediency, according to his own pleasure? We are indeed enrolled at our baptism, all of us, as soldiers of Christ; we pray for the Church militant here on earth, and we are bound to follow our Lord as the great Captain of our salvation. But what is this warfare appointed to us, compared with that undertaken by the Jesuit legion? Or how can the former consist with the latter? To suffer, to die, to bear witness to the truth in the face of the enemy, to mortify our flesh, to slay our own vices, to direct our battle daily and hourly against the enemy in our own hearts, and to expel him from his stronghold in others only by the word and the name of Christ—to do all this under the command of Him, and following His example in patience, lowliness, quietness, humility, and obedience to all his constituted authorities, neither striving, nor crying, or lifting a hand against our enemies: this is the true Christian warfare, which seeks for no kingdom upon earth, and recognizes no other mode of victory but abandonment of self in obedience to God. It has no intrigues, no

manœuvres, no subtle human organization, no commands to allure one class and flatter another, to manage princes and attract the populace. All that it says, and does, and thinks, and hopes, is open to the whole world. Its very warfare is the destruction of war and the security of peace. Can this be said of that camp, and those arms, and the forces, and ambuscades, and stratagems, and fiery zeal, and worldly policy, of the wealth and possessions, the principles and arts which form the campaigns of Ignatius and his followers? Does it not more resemble Mahometanism than Christianity—a religion promulgated by the sword, whether of artifice or of force, than the religion of One, who in order that He might be crowned with glory, died patiently and unresistingly on the cross?

And for those who, disgusted with unthinking and undiscriminating attacks upon Romanism, look on it with tolerant, and, it may be, with even favouring, eyes, fixing on the Catholic portions of its system which it has still retained, and apologizing by them for its acknowledged corruption, will it be an unfair or hard petition that they would examine Jesuitism in itself, and trace if it be not merely an expansion of the purely Romish features of Romanism, to the exclusion and suppression of all that is Catholic? Does Jesuitism reverence Christian antiquity as the standard of the Church, or does it proclaim a new development of doctrine? Does it appeal to the fathers, or put aside their authority? Does it maintain an immutable standard of faith, or set the door open for indefinite changes? Does it preach obedience to rulers, or privilege itself against them all by the very charter of its constitution? Does it enforce self-denial, or cast away at once all the discipline and asceticism, so attractive to modern eyes, in the ancient religious communities? Is it framed to spread devotion, or are their churches closed by statute against their own daily and public prayer? Do they look with awe on the sacraments, or do they teach men to profane the most holy of Christian mysteries, by bringing thousands both to Baptism and the Lord's Supper, in an unprepared, undisciplined state; calculating the faithfulness of their own service, not by the purity of chastened hearts, but by the multitude of crowds that flock to them—counting their Christianity by heads? Weak hearts are longing for the restoration of more intimate and personal communion between their pastors and their consciences. But why? Not that they may receive opiates to remorse, and licences to sin, but that they may be placed under a more rigid and unbending rule, and be awakened more keenly to their shame and guilt. Is such the object or the influence of Jesuit casuistry? Did the Roman Catholic Church itself think so? The holy men of the Romish

Church of old abandoned themselves to a self-chosen poverty, whether with reason or not we need not inquire. And in the midst of that idolatry of mammon, which chills our hearts and repels our affections, the very name of poverty is ennobled. Where is the poverty of Jesuitism? Or have their riches exceeded those of monarchs? Are they mendicants only in name, to obtain the honours and the rewards of religious mendicity, while in reality they are lords of estates, merchants, bankers, shopkeepers, manufacturers—a whole army of mammon? Even in those æsthetic considerations of the fancy and of art, which, it is to be feared, have entered too largely into the religious movements of the present day, and which yet are closely linked with deeper questions, and are no slight evidences of the inward spirit, does Jesuitism exhibit the slightest affinity with that grandeur, severity, and purity, which fascinate newly-awakened minds in ancient religious systems? Or is there no architecture so tawdry, no music so effeminate, no eloquence so tumid and bombastic, no ecclesiastical decoration so vulgar in the whole compass of Roman art as that of the Jesuits? We have no wish to pronounce on such a question. But we do ask, that minds led captive by the æstheticism of religion, should put it to themselves.

But there are far graver thoughts beyond these. That which startles even the most partial observers in the old Romish system, but which is there excused as an accidental appendage, an excrescence capable of being softened down and reduced into some tolerable subordination to genuine Christianity, its Mariolatry,—this in Jesuitism becomes the leading idea, the main object of the whole system. Founders of institutions are most often types and prophecies of the institution themselves. And Ignatius, vowing himself to the service of the Virgin in the gallant devotion of ancient chivalry, has been more than imitated by his army. It is, in truth, a church of the Virgin rather than of Christ [4].

So it is with the saint-worship, with the old-wives' legends, with the pride, the ambition, the irregularity, the exclusiveness, with every other vice in the two systems. From being excrescences in Romanism, they have become essentials in Jesuitism. Remove them, and what remains?

Let these facts be fairly and honestly examined—let a really religious mind then take up the prophecies in Scripture which

[4] See note, p. 48, "Compte Rendu," by Monclar. Pallavacini, in his History of the Council of Trent, demands of the Reformers if it would be reasonable to return to Gothic architecture and ancient music. "Autres temps, autres mœurs." The papal nuncio argued that we might as well return to feed on acorns as to the examples of the primitive Church.

point to some great defection within the Church in these the latter days—let him take the marks there set upon this defection, and ask, when they are searched for in the theory and the practice of Jesuitism, if a single one be missing, even those which recent writers most anxious to relieve Rome from the application of them have professed to find wanting in the merely Roman system. The individual monarch—the radical political principles—the vast commerce—the secular empire—which occur in the signs of Antichrist—are not these all found in the Jesuit empire?

And if others are allured to it by the thought that to meet the evils of the present day some vast and even overwhelming power must be found, capable of coping with them, though by hazardous and scarcely legitimate weapons, must they not listen to the warnings, both of history and of Scripture, not to do evil that good may come. In England—whatever anxiety we may feel—however desperate the effort to grapple with the false opinions of the day, and with the poverty and misery of the masses—are we not bound to avert every longing thought which turns to any other instruments of good than may be found or created within the bosom of our own Church, in harmony with our Prayer-Book, in obedience to our bishops, in conformity with the Scripture! Many such instruments are now forming around us, and within us, in this spirit, and their efficacy and power surpasses the most sanguine expectation. There is nothing to prevent us from creating within the Church of England institutions, whether for charity, or education, or the improvement of the poor, which may contain all the good to be found in Romanism, without its evils.

Postscript.—These observations were in type before the recent convulsions of Europe had made England perhaps the only remaining place of refuge for the Jesuit community, and the centre of their future operations. May the eyes of Englishmen be opened in time, before it is too late!

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS,

ETC.

1. Warburton's Rollo and his Race. 2. Bunsen's Egypt's Place in Universal History. 3. Heygate's William Blake. 4. Soames' Latin Church in Anglo-Saxon Times. 5. Rickman's Architecture in England from the Conquest to the Reformation. 6. Millard's Historical Notices of the Office of Choristers. 7. Archdeacon Hoare on Baptism. 8. Mill's Five Sermons. 9. Hanna's Posthumous Works of Chalmers. 10. Tales of Kirkbeck. 11. Peile's Annotations on 1 Corinthians. 12. Hoare's Harmony of the Apocalypse with other Prophecies. 13. Andersen's Shoes of Fortune. 14. Sangster's Servant's Claim. 15. Harold, the Last of the Saxon Kings. 16. Swayne's Specimens from Schiller and Uhland. 17. Wordsworth on the Canon of the New Testament and Apocrypha. 18. Speculum Episcopi. 19. Macleane's Sermons for Schools and Families. 20. Biber's Royal Supremacy over the Church. 21. Mount's Guide to Candidates for Holy Orders. 22. Monro's Combatants. 23. Maskell's Holy Baptism. 24. Watts's Divine and Moral Songs. 25. Nind's Odes of Klopstock. 26. Geale's Two Years in Italy. 27. Hicks's Manual of Family Devotion. 28. Evans's Scripture Biography. 29. Watson's Seven Sayings on the Cross. 30. Sworde's Exposition of the first Seventeen Articles of the Church. 31. Hill's Scenes of 1792. 32. Via Dolorosa. 33. The Baron's Little Daughter. 34. Ross's Reciprocal Obligations of the Church and Civil Power. 35. Family Prayers for Cottagers. 36. Renaud's Matutina. 37. Conversations on the Church Service. 38. Nimrod. 39. Drury's Annesley and other Poems. 40. Ogilvie's Imperial Dictionary. 41. Butler's Sermons on Human Nature, &c., ed. by Whewell. 42. Crakanthorp's Defensio Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ. 43. McClelland's Predestination and Election Vindicated. 44. Whewell's Sermons. 45. Rawnsley's Sermons—Warren's Sermons—Pellew's Sermons. 46. Miscellaneous.

1.—*Rollo and his Race; or, Footsteps of the Normans. By* Acton Warburton. In 2 vols. London: Bentley.

Those who have been impressed with the religious fervour and brilliant descriptions of the "Crescent and the Cross," or who have been interested in the deep feeling and sound sense of "Hochelaga," the productions of the Warburton brothers, will have hailed with pleasure the work of a third member of the family, "Rollo and his Race." Its subject, however, being of a less lofty nature than that of either of its predecessors, the book is, of course, of a less striking mould; but we must add our opinion, that the author only required a wider sphere for his talents to have raised his writings to an equality of rank. More fanciful in its imaginative aspirations, and less full of direct information, we are yet at no loss to discern here and there similar outpourings of that right good feeling which so eminently characterized the two former books.

A less sketchy style would perhaps have better suited the "Footsteps of the Normans;" and its readers will probably be of opinion that the historical parts should have borne a larger proportion than they do to the didactic parts. The subject is one of peculiar interest to a large number of the families who

now boast themselves English; and, as few of them have turned as much attention to the early history of their Norman progenitors as it deserved, we think that many of them will be very thankful for having those noble minds, which in that age raised France and then England far above the level of the surrounding nations, rescued from oblivion, and brought within the compass of easy perusal; and on closing the history of "Rollo and his Race," they will only regret, that while wandering with Mr. Warburton among the pleasant meadows of Neustria, and gazing with veneration at her glorious shrines, he has not made them more historically acquainted with the individual lives and heroic exploits of their ancestors.

The book opens with an account of Queen Victoria's interview with Louis Philippe at Le Tréport, and a comparison of its significance with the two former meetings of English and French sovereigns on the same soil. It is followed by a rapidly condensed memoir of Louis Philippe, whose expulsion from the throne of France, coming just at the moment of its publication, formed the stormy sequel to his already eventful life, and did no great credit to the sagacity of the author, who, in his homage to the political talents of the last King of the French, seems to have mistaken cunning for wisdom, intrigue for statesmanship, and obstinacy for firmness; blunders which have plunged Europe into a sea of wrong, confusion, and, we fear, of lasting grief.

Interesting notices and vivid descriptions of the glorious architectural remains, which make Normandy so enchanting to the antiquary, fill up all that can be spared in the first volume from the space allotted to the history of the first five illustrious Dukes of Normandy—Rollo, Longsword, Richard the Fearless, Richard the Good, and Robert the Magnificent; all of which are drawn with so masterly a hand, that every reader will regret their having been so much compressed; for "we might well linger over this refreshing page in the sickening record of the world's average rulers. It is scarcely possible to contemplate this singular uniformity of worth, through five successive generations, without acknowledging the hand of Providence."—vol. i. p. 263.

In the second volume we have a sketch of William our Conqueror, and some pleasing reflections on the sacred institutions founded by him and by his saintly queen, in penance for their marriage, which was said to be within the unlawful degrees of consanguinity. We have not room to discuss the validity either of the marriage, or of the objection; but it does not appear by the old chronicles that Matilda's affection was very potential in overcoming that objection, as she repeatedly refused his hand; and it was not until William had convinced her of the strength of both his hand and his passion, by seizing her in the street,

rolling her in the dirt, and bestowing upon her a good beating, that she consented to become his duchess. We should be glad to know how far our gallant author, in his admiration of Teutonic customs, approves of this singular method of courtship. In another place Mr. Warburton becomes quite enthusiastic over the signature of Duke William (vol. i. p. 232), "a simple cross!" Perhaps, at the moment of that ebullition, he had forgotten the Conqueror's favourite saying, that "an illiterate king was a crowned ass!"

Further on we find a rapid but vigorous account of that "brilliant though evanescent dynasty" of the Norman kings of Sicily; from William, the gallant son of Tancred de Hauteville, down to Manfred, the betrayed and deserted king. As one of the "footsteps" of the Normans in a foreign land, it is a bright and interesting episode in the history of that heroic race, and is certainly more deserving the space it occupies in "Rollo and his Race," than the thirty pages devoted to the oft-told tale of the war in La Vendée, which we think has indeed but little to do with the Norwegian monarch of ancient Neustria. A more detailed account of the descendants of his brethren, who soon after settled in (and, according to Mr. Warburton, civilized) England, would have been far more useful and pleasing. To those who can trace an unbroken line from the present day up to the chivalrous company who colonized the fairest portions of our fair country, these "Footsteps" are deeply interesting, especially where we fancy that we can recognize in their descendants of the present days any traces of the high-souled honour, courage, and energy of the Teutonic spirit; and, for example, fondly link Hastings the Governor-General of India, to Hastings the Viking.—(vol. ii. pp. 231—241.)

Mr. Warburton's ideal of the Norman character is certainly rather lofty: but we do not call it inadmissibly exaggerate. He professes to have attempted only "to collect some traces of the genius of the Normans" (Preface, p. 17); and we are not surprised that an enthusiastic mind, dwelling in the land of chivalry, romance, and heroism—and lingering in the time-honoured aisles where rest the ashes of our wise and valiant forefathers—should now and then a little too vividly recognize the grandest qualities in their characters; which, through our more sober optics, may be seen under a more questionable light—

"The actions of the mighty dead, read in boyhood with glistening eyes, and stored in our hearts for imitation, though never wholly forgotten, yet obscured by the mist arising from the intervening agitation of maturer life—revive with thousandfold vividness, and are invested with an interest beyond the force of books or language, as we stand beside the graves of those by whom they were achieved. By a principle of antagonism, the greatness that once belonged to them is power-

fully suggested by the nothing they are now! And thus the sepulchres of the great and good have a double instruction. They not only tell us, as the lowliest tomb might do, that we are mortal, they further remind us how much is in a mortal's power. They tell us we have but a short time to do the Creator's work, but they also teach us how faithfully it may be done."—(vol. i. pp. 265, 266.)

We regret that we have room but for one more extract, but we think all our readers will agree in the feeling here expressed:—

"To inspect the churches seems naturally the first business in a mediæval town. In these days, when economy is the ruling principle in religious architecture, when the house of God is deemed no longer worthy of the national thought and wealth, how refreshing are those churches of the pious times when every stone was an evidence of care and love, and the whole building adorned with the nation's wealth—charged with the fulness of the people's heart. We generally find ourselves, therefore, in the morning, crossing the threshold of some ancient church. Few, I think, can stand beneath those calm and lofty aisles, so eloquent of ancient piety, without receiving something of a serene and holy spirit; and it appears to me, that the earlier in the day this good deed is done, the better. The doors are ever open: the Catholic Church takes care that her children shall never want a consecrated retreat, where the world-weary and the sinner may withdraw from the tumult of existence, to offer up their prayers to God. Protestant England! remember the cottage and the hovel, where the orisons of the poor are interrupted by earthly sounds, perhaps of discord or of sin; set wide the gates of your temples, and let them have a spot to pray in, whose atmosphere has been never stirred, except with words of heaven!"—pp. 148, 149.

* * * * *

"Blessed be those ever-open churches! Their portals yield to an infant's touch. The porches, sloping inwards, have a beseeching aspect; they draw you towards them, and invite you to come in. You need not wait till the Sabbath to enter the house of prayer! You may kneel at the altar to-day, and as you pass by may ask a blessing on your labour in a retired and consecrated spot. We might take a lesson from the Roman Catholic Church, that devotion is not a mere Sunday exercise; that the week-day as well as the Sabbath prayer is better said within the sacred walls: that the aspect of the Church should be familiar as the face of home."—pp. 219, 220.

Nor have we room to linger as pleasantly as the reader will over many of the individual characters of the race of Rollo; for his sake we wish that their "footsteps" had been more chronologically classed; but instead of being over-careful to record its blemishes, we shall adopt the more grateful task of recommending to our readers this book as one which will surely increase their knowledge of Norman lore—which to those who

have happily passed a summer in "La Belle France," will recall something of their sunny hours and of her "riant" landscape—and which will excite in them a fair hope of meeting again in future volumes a fuller development of the high principles and refined mind of the painter of "Rollo and his Race."

II.—*Egypt's Place in Universal History: an Historical Investigation, in Five Books. By* CHRISTIAN C. J. BUNSEN, *D.Ph. and D.C.L. Translated from the German, by* CHARLES H. COTTRELL, *Esq., M.A. Vol. I.* London: Longmans.

THE volume before us contains the first book of Chevalier Bunsen's work on Egypt. To enter at any length on the important questions discussed in it, would demand a far more careful study than we have as yet been enabled to give to the subject. The present volume is of a preliminary character, entering into details on the sources from which a knowledge of the Egyptian history may be derived, pointing out the high importance of the subject in its bearing on the early history of the human race, and presenting copious vocabularies of the Egyptian language, with explanations of the hieroglyphical characters. As far as we can gather from a cursory survey, Chevalier Bunsen carries back the history of the human race to a period several thousand years more remote than that of the ordinary Bible chronology; but we gather that he conceives the true chronology of the Bible is in accordance with his views. He distinguishes between the opinions of commentators and the statements of the Bible itself. It is needless to direct attention to such a work as this; its research and the high importance of the subject will doubtless attract the general notice of the learned world.

III.—*William Blake; or, the English Farmer. By the Rev.* W. E. HEYGATE, *M.A., Author of "Probatio Clerica," &c.* London: Masters.

WE have perused this little volume with interest and edification. It is intended to direct the attention of the clergy to the especial case of the farmers—a most important class of men, whose influence over the labouring class is, in many places, almost exclusive of all other; and who are frequently not sufficiently guided and influenced by those whose advice and instruction would be willingly received if judiciously imparted. There is a feeling of sturdy independence, for the most part, in the English farmer, which revolts against dictation of any kind; but there is much of good feeling at bottom if it can be aroused; and the parish

priest need never despair, even under the most unpromising circumstances, of winning the aid of his farmers to the cause of truth, of morality, and religion, if he will condescend to treat them as rational beings, and to gain their confidence by kindness, humbleness of mind, and earnestness in the discharge of his duty. The story before us, which is very interesting and well told, relates the mode of proceeding by which a clergyman, newly-appointed to a benefice, succeeded in gaining influence for good over the farmers of his parish, and the beneficial effects as regarded the cause of religion and morality, which were the results. We recommend this volume in the strongest manner to the clergy, from the valuable practical directions with which it abounds. We feel assured that they will value it, as every suggestion for the promotion of morality, and the removal of the causes of vice and immorality, deserves to be valued and attended to.

IV.—*The Latin Church during Anglo-Saxon Times. By* HENRY SOAMES, *M.A., Editor of Mosheim's Institutes.* London: Longmans.

MR. SOAMES is well known to the public as a useful and laborious contributor to ecclesiastical history. His History of the Reformation, History of the Anglo-Saxon Church, Elizabethan Religious history, and edition of Mosheim, bear testimony to the assiduity and research which have produced so much fruit; and although we certainly cannot place him in the first class as an historical writer, for various reasons, yet he must be regarded with respect for the qualities we have already referred to, and for the consistency and general soundness of principle which his writings evince. We may also add, the tone of feeling generally through Mr. Soames' works is not that of a mere partizan.

The volume under consideration has for its object to present a just and fair view of the character of religion in the Anglo-Saxon Church, in reply to the observations of Dr. Lingard on a former work of the author's. It is to a considerable extent controversial as well as historical; and from all we have seen, we deem it a satisfactory reply to the Romish writer, and a work of substantial merit. The subjects on which Mr. Soames treats are the following:—The Mission under Gregory the Great—The Conversion of the British Isles—Archbishop Theodore—Confession and Absolution—The Origin of Papal Ecclesiastical Power—The Equality of the Apostles Peter and Paul—The Progress of Papal Power—Image-worship—Papal Appeals—Wilfrid—Eucharistic Questions—Developments.

v.—*An Attempt to discriminate the Styles of Architecture in England from the Conquest to the Reformation, &c. By the late* Thomas Rickman, *F.S.A. Fifth Edition; with very considerable additions, and new plates.* London and Oxford: J. H. Parker.

We are indebted to Mr. Parker for an edition of Rickman, which presents several new and valuable features, and is, beyond comparison, the most instructive, as well as the most beautifully got-up, edition of this standard work on Gothic architecture which it has ever been our fortune to see. Mr. Parker has added tenfold to the worth of the volume by replacing Mr. Rickman's *designs* of Gothic details by drawings from ancient models. The work on which so much well-chosen illustration is bestowed, is one which ought to be in the hands of every one who is interested in the study of ecclesiastical architecture, being, as it is, the original text-book from which the usual nomenclature of the science is derived; and forming, with the additional matter inserted by the present editor, the best and most popularly-written manual on the subject. We are very glad to see old Rickman so worthily treated; and the work, in its present shape, is one which abounds in wood-cuts and engravings of such great beauty, that it is as much suited to the drawing-room as to the library.

vi.—*Historical Notices of the Office of Choristers. By the Rev.* James Elwin Millard, *B.A., Head Master of Magdalen College School, Oxford.* London: Masters.

This little volume is valuable, not only as exhibiting a short survey of the origin and history of choristers in cathedral and collegiate churches, but it is practically instructive in the view which it presents of the pious care of the founders of collegiate institutions for the religious and moral training of their choir-children, and the judicious provisions which were made for their education. The position of choristers in the present day has sadly deteriorated; but we feel that a debt of gratitude is due to Mr. Millard, for bringing thus prominently before the attention of the Church a class of youths, who ought not to be neglected and laid aside when their voices no longer become serviceable in the church. Mr. Millard suggests various plans for rendering the services of choristers available to the Church on their retirement from their respective choirs. To these suggestions we hope that attention will be paid. We are sure that every chapter ought to consider the questions brought before them in this very pleasing, well-written, and sensible little volume.

VII.—*Baptism; or, the Ministration of Public Baptism of Infants, to be used in the Church; scripturally illustrated and explained. By the Ven.* C. J. HOARE, *A.M., Archdeacon of Surrey, &c.* London: Hatchards.

THE object of this work is to present a simple and intelligible commentary on the office for the Baptism of Infants. We have no doubt that it will be found useful in many cases; more especially from the devotional and Christian spirit which pervades its pages. A short extract will explain the doctrinal views of the author, who has no hesitation in stating that,

"There is no doubt that at the period at which these offices were prepared, as well as in all former periods of the Christian Church from the earliest ages, that term (regeneration) was habitually always associated with the baptismal ceremony. Hence our Church was not likely to have felt the difficulty which later controversies have raised in the use of the same language. Those who are even moderately conversant with the early writings of the Church at large, will fully subscribe to the truth of this remark."

The following passage is also worthy of remark:—

"Before the act of baptism takes place, we pray for these: 'Give thy Holy Spirit unto them, that they may be born again, and be made heirs of everlasting salvation, through our Lord Jesus Christ.' After baptism, we also observe the recital of the same petition, 'Give thy Holy Spirit unto them,' but with the new addition, 'that they *being* born again, and being made heirs of everlasting salvation,' may *continue* thy servants and attain thy promises. . . . The most solemn of all baptismal ceremonies ever known in the history of the Church was that on the day of Pentecost; after three thousand souls had been converted by the sermon of Peter, and had gladly received the word of the Lord. We believe that their faith on that occasion had been instantly called into action upon the great truths they had heard, and their knowledge and experience of the Divine power, in their own conversion to God, suddenly and exceedingly enlarged. But were they then formally born again? Were they then the ascertained and recognized heirs of everlasting salvation in the Church of Christ? No; they needed yet one thing. They were not, in the *eye of the Church*, yet born again into all the gracious provisions of its Divine covenant. But, it is added, 'then they that gladly received his word were baptized; and the same day there was added unto' the Church 'three thousand souls.' And so 'the Lord added to the Church daily such as should be saved.'"—pp. 101—103.

We trust this work will be found extensively useful in removing the prejudices which are opposed to the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, as taught in the formularies of the English Church.

VIII.—*Five Sermons on the Nature of Christianity, preached in Advent and Christmas-tide*, 1846, *before the University of Cambridge. By* W. H. MILL, *D.D., Christian Advocate, &c.* London: Masters.

THESE sermons are admirably adapted to the thoughtful and intelligent audience before whom they were delivered. They present an excellent specimen of Dr. Mill's comprehensive and reflective mode of treating his subject. These sermons are intended to guard the minds of the young against certain popular errors and theories, and amongst others, against that of Development, in the sense advocated by some of the late separatists. The first and third of the sermons are more especially devoted to this subject. Dr. Mill, while admitting a development in Revelation *on the whole*, and a development of *form* and *expression* in Christian doctrine, entirely rejects and confutes the wild and fanciful theory which has been of late built up. At the conclusion of the volume, Dr. Mill substantiates by quotations certain remarks which he had made on a part of Luther's writings, which had been resented by that hot-tempered and prejudiced writer, Archdeacon Hare.

IX.—*Posthumous Works of* THOMAS CHALMERS, *D.D. Edited by the Rev.* W. HANNA. Vols. II. and III.

THESE volumes carry on the series of daily Scripture readings, on which we have commented in a former number, from the Book of Judges to that of Jeremiah. Their general tone and style presents very much the same features as those which we observed in the first volume. As relics of so remarkable a man as Chalmers, they will be interesting to a large class of readers, and they present many passages characteristic of his forcible and striking style of composition.

X.—*Tales of Kirkbeck; or, the Parish in the Fells. By the Author of "Lives of certain Fathers of the Church in the Fourth Century."* London: Cleaver.

THE records of a pastor's experience in any parish must generally be tinged with sadness, even amidst the greatest measure of success in his holy ministrations. This is exemplified in the really beautiful series of tales now before us. They are most touchingly told, and bear about them a character of reality far more than is usual in publications of this description. This little work seems to us likely to be of use to various classes both within and without the Church.

XI.—*Annotations on St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians, designed chiefly for the Use of Students of the Greek Text. By* THOMAS WILLIAMSON PEILE, *D.D., Head Master of Repton School, &c. &c.* London: Rivingtons.

THIS volume is the second portion of the series of Annotations on the Greek Text of the New Testament, which the author announced on presenting to the public his work on the Epistle to the Romans. Having very recently reviewed at length the latter volume, we are under the necessity of bestowing only a notice on the present one. This circumstance we thus expressly mention in justice to the author, because the work really merits a particular examination and full reviewal, being, at least, not inferior to its predecessor either in ability or importance. The appearance in due time of this second portion we regard as a sign, that all is well with the author and his undertaking; a sign of continuing zeal and confidence within, and of encouragement from without. A steady advance like the present is all that ought to be expected; for any thing like rapidity is, from the very nature of the subject, incompatible with proper execution, however laborious the writer, and however ripe for his task.

To make extracts, unless it were done to an extent which our limits forbid, would not be serviceable to our readers, nor, indeed, fair towards the author. We remark, however, in general, that the characteristic of Dr. Peile's mode of annotation to which we called attention on a former occasion, is here fully sustained; namely, a close observation of the precise meaning of the letter of the text, in the light of its intrinsic elements of force and perspicuity; without, however, a restriction to the bare process, but with an application to the immediate results. We will venture to give one short specimen, in a note on chap. vi. 5:—

"Ἀπελούσασθε might be translated simply, *ye have had yourselves washed, i. e.* have submitted yourselves to the rite of Christian baptism; but the Apostle is manifestly reminding the Corinthians of what that holy baptism pledged them to, and of the awful privileges which were then vouchsafed in answer to the prayer of faith, and solemn invocation of the name of the Lord. Compare Acts xxii. 16, *βάπτισαι, καὶ ἀπόλουσαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας σου, ἐπικαλεσάμενος τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου.*"

Those whose use of the original text of Scripture is superficial or desultory, are little aware of the treasures they are neglecting, and which are fairly within their reach by means either of their own acquirements or the aid of others, and that too without entering on the uncertain ground of the recondite or the mystical.

We ought also to remark, that assistance is rendered in these annotations in a way of which advantage has not hitherto been duly taken; namely, by giving renderings of particular passages, intended to convey their meaning with a degree of precision too often impracticable in a translation, which is rigidly bound down to the letter, and yet such as are quite distinct in their kind from what is professedly paraphrastic.

Now that an effort has been called forth to advance theological knowledge in the direction of greater accuracy and completeness on the part of the generality of its students, fresh implements may well be required without impeachment of the immutability of the science. For our own part, the retrospect of our earlier years presents a sad vacuity as respects a supply of ready and suitable appliances. When, therefore, an earnest and well qualified labourer offers his contribution of service, we trust there will not be wanting those who will warmly welcome and appreciate the gift, and will call on others to profit by its aid.

XII.—*The Harmony of the Apocalypse, with other Prophecies of Holy Scripture; with Notes, and an outline of the various Interpretations. By the Rev.* WILLIAM HENRY HOARE, *M.A., late Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge.* London: Parker. 1848.

THIS volume contains the authorized version of the Apocalypse, accompanied with a new Paraphrase and Notes, critical and explanatory. It exhibits a very useful synoptical analysis of the interpretations of the various commentators who have endeavoured to elucidate this mysterious portion of the sacred Canon, which is daily deriving fresh interest and importance from the remarkable phenomena of these eventful times. We are very glad to see that Mr. Hoare has treated this solemn subject with the sober reverence, which is one of the most valuable characteristics of a faithful minister of the Church of England, and which is specially required, and rarely found, in an interpreter of the Apocalypse. We refer to pp. 204 and 218 as expository of his views concerning the book generally. We should have been pleased with a little more reserve concerning the millennium, and with a caution to the general reader that some of the theories in pp. 132—136, and Appendix (I.) on that subject have been regarded by the far greater number of Doctors of the Church as heretical. But upon the whole, we cordially recommend the volume to our readers.

XIII.—*The Shoes of Fortune, and other Tales. By* HANS CHRISTIAN ANDERSEN. *With Four Drawings, by* OTTO SPECKTER, *and other Illustrations.* London: Chapman and Hall.

WE have seldom derived greater pleasure than that which we have experienced in the perusal of this little volume. If originality without affectation, simplicity without weakness, exuberant fancy so strictly in keeping that in the strangest and most novel circumstances we feel quite at home; if these, combined with playful wit and satire so delicate as to be scarcely perceptible, and healthfulness of tone and kindliness of feeling, can render fairy tales pleasing, these are so in the highest degree; and, beyond and above all these things, there is a deep moral running through almost every tale, and a reverential cast of thought throughout the volume, which greatly increases its value. The one great lesson taught by the great majority, perhaps by all the tales, is, that, content with our lot, accompanied by a sincere attempt to do our duty in it both to God and man, is the true secret of human happiness.

The following passage reminds us of some of our earlier essayists:—

"A young surgeon having unconsciously put on the 'Shoes of Fortune,' feels a desire to examine the hearts of a row in the theatre, and exclaims, 'Ah! I wish to Heaven I could walk in and take a trip right through the hearts of those present.' And, behold, to the 'Shoes of Fortune' this was the cue: the whole man shrunk together, and a most uncommon journey through the hearts of the front row of spectators now began. The first heart through which he came was that of a middle-aged lady, but he instantly fancied himself in the room of 'the institution for the cure of the crooked and deformed,' where casts of misshapen limbs are displayed in naked reality on the wall. Yet there was this difference: in the institution the casts were taken at the entry of the patient, but here they were retained and guarded in the heart, while the sound persons went away. They were namely casts of female friends, whose bodily or mental deformities were here most faithfully preserved.

"With the snake-like writhings of an idea, he glided into another female heart; but this seemed to him like a large holy fane. The white dove of innocence fluttered over the altar. How gladly would he have sunk upon his knees, but he must away to the next heart; yet he still heard the pealing tones of the organ, and he himself seemed to have become a newer and a better man; he felt unworthy to tread the neighbouring sanctuary, which a poor garret, with a sick bed-rid mother, revealed. But God's warm sun streamed through the open window, lovely roses nodded from the wooden flower-boxes on the

roof, and two sky-blue birds sang joyously, while the sick mother implored God's richest blessings on her pious daughter.

"He now crept on hands and feet through a butcher's shop. At least on every side, and above and below there was nought but flesh. It was the heart of a most respectable rich man, whose name is certain to be found in the Directory.

"He was now in the heart of the wife of this worthy gentleman. It was an old, dilapidated, mouldering dovecot. The husband's portrait was used as a weathercock, which was connected in some way or other with the doors, and so they opened and shut of their own accord, whenever the stern old husband turned round.

"Hereupon he wandered into a boudoir formed entirely of mirrors, like the one in Castle Rosenburg; but here the glasses magnified to an astonishing degree. On the floor, in the middle of the room, sat, like a Dalai-Lama, the insignificant 'Self' of the person, quite confounded at his own greatness. He then imagined he had got into a needle-case full of pointed needles of every size. 'This is certainly the heart of an old maid,' thought he: but he was mistaken. It was the heart of a young military man; a man, as people said, of talent and feeling."—pp. 28, 29.

The "Fir Tree" is a delightful fable. The "Snow Queen," one of the most beautiful fictions that it has ever been our lot to peruse. We will not do it the injustice of making a quotation. The "Red Shoes" we commend to the young of all stations and both sexes. "The Bell" is a mystery of great depth and power; it should be studied.

The engravings by Otto Speckter are well designed and well executed; and the minor illustrations very good in their way.

In conclusion, should any of our readers wish a little healthy relaxation for himself, or a useful as well as delightful present for a young friend, let him lose no time in purchasing "The Shoes of Fortune."

XIV.—*The Servant's Claim upon the Christian Master. By the Rev.* C. SANGSTER, *M.A., Curate of High Hoyland.* London: Longmans. 1848.

A PLAIN statement of a great truth; but apparently the production of a young and hitherto unpractised writer.

XV.—*Harold, the Last of the Saxon Kings. By the Author of "Rienzi," "The Last of the Barons," &c.* In 3 vols. London: Bentley.

NEITHER a romance nor a chronicle is this: the charm of fiction and the reality of history are both wanting. Much of this reproach might, no doubt, apply to Sir Edward's last historical

study, the chronicle of the white and red roses, "The Last of the Barons." But, there were minute details of description and of fact; there, was much accurate characterization also; and, above all, there, was real interest attached to the fictitious characters of Sybil, the Astrologer, and Hastings. Here every thing is vague and indistinct. Little is known of the intimate details of those old Saxon days which are here striven to be reproduced. The author has apparently feared to invent, lest he should fall into discrepancies of various orders: and so he has generally followed the plain course of history, the leading events of which alone are known. The character of Harold may be said to be finely drawn; but little, very little, has been added to the Harold of history. The heroine, Edith, is a comparative failure: the reader's mind retains no distinct impression concerning her; she is vague, shadowy, lifeless. More energy is exhibited in the sketch of the Vala, or northern prophetess, Hilda, whose personality is finely conceived, but rather suggested than clearly embodied by the author. Indeed, there is much of this sketchiness about the entire work, which we could fancy thrown off in a few weeks by a clever man. And on this score we must especially censure Sir Edward Lytton, who has always appeared to us till now to treat the public with respect, and give only his "best," in an artistic point of view, to the world. Here we consider it obvious, that he might have done far better; though the subject, as conceived by him, was scarcely adapted to a romance. We have seen a play, or rather a dramatic poem on the same theme, by Friedrich Kind, author of the clever "libretto" of "Der Freischütz," which approached nearer in form to our ideal of treatment, but was deficient in energy, power, and purpose. Bulwer has seen rightly, that the only source of living interest in connexion with the subject could be deduced from the apposition of the Saxon and the Norman races; but this, as we before remarked, is rather suggested than carried out; and, for this reason among others, the whole work has the appearance of a sketch, a "première ébauche," destined to be worked up into a real creation, instinct with more enduring vitality, and leaving a far deeper impression on the mind. But, to resume our remarks in detail, there is infinite grandeur in one conception of our author's, (also barely indicated,) which consists in the contrasting a heathen prophetess, using magic—but, as she believes, divine art, with the fearful Witch, supposed, like the devils with whom she enters into covenant, "to believe" in the Christian's God "and tremble." Sir Edward wanted faith for the execution of this grand idea: he feared that he might be ridiculed by rationalizing critics,

if he assumed the personal existence of the Evil One as an undoubted fact. Hilda, however, finding her northern deities desert her, is supposed to have recourse to this baleful witch, who undertakes, by her evil art, to show her the shadows of the future and the mysteries of existence. This terrible vision is presumed to have revealed to the prophetess, one of the last representatives of an expiring faith, who clings with all her heart and soul to the memories of her youth and race, that the gods, whom she has loved and served and trusted, are the demons of the Christian world; and that she, unconsciously, has entered into compact with the foes of human kind. This terrible knowledge shatters reason and life at once: she perishes; saved, let us trust, by the boundless virtue of His atoning blood, whom she in ignorance denied. For, we confess, that this conception appears to us neither monstrous nor superstitious. That the powers of ill have had shrines and oracles of their own, and also innocent and noble-hearted believers, we doubt not; and we are not of those who would despair of the fate of heathens, remembering that "Christ is the light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world." To return to our more immediate theme, despite the sketchiness complained of, various characters are ably indicated. The cautious and worldly-wise Godwin, Harold's father, the unfortunate brother Sweyn, the evil-hearted Tostig, the merry Leofwine, the true and gentle Gurth, are all painted boldly and correctly. The Welsh king Gryffith is another very fortunate sketch; and the entire "book," which treats of his fortunes, has much merit. Aldyth, his wife, and afterwards Harold's, is unpleasantly, but perhaps not unnaturally, depicted. The Norman knight, Mallet de Graville, is very cleverly thrown out with a few bold strokes, and well contrasted with the Kentish Vebba, and the Saxon courtier Godrith. One or two other Normans are characteristically depicted, Taillefer, the minstrel, the martial and worldly Archbishop Odo, and William of Normandy himself, who, however, is scarcely sufficiently painted in detail. Edward the Confessor is well conceived and depicted, as an embodiment of middle-age asceticism; which, if scarcely appreciated in its higher sense by the author, is nevertheless not condemned without justice. The Christianity however of the entire work is rather dubious. Sir Edward appears to us to conceive that the Christian revelation is only a phase of truth, and that One still higher and greater is yet in the womb of Time: on which theme he seems to have caught some of the cant of Emerson, Carlyle, Jerrold, and their "confrères." True it is, that we "now see through a glass darkly;" but we *do* see; and the wondrous mystery, which most attracts our gaze, of the Divine atonement for human sin, though

it may, if possible, be yet more fully revealed to us, must ever remain the centre of truth, and the goal of all knowledge and perception. The critics may possibly hail "Harold" with rapture, even as they exulted in "Rienzi," and strive to make amends to the author for their exaggerated censures of his "Lucretia," which though an extremely unpleasant and somewhat untasteful book, was by no means so blamable on the score of religion or morality as the majority of "thinkers" have thought proper to assert. Reviewers of a pantheistic turn of mind, who deny nothing, who are unwilling even to condemn the evil as evil, were furious with Sir Edward for not only depicting the most abhorrent crimes, but representing them as co-existent with intellectual superiority, which in these gentlemen's estimation, (who suppose themselves to be men of genius,) is tantamount to the possession of all the virtues. But, whether critics praise or blame, Sir Edward Lytton may rest assured that "Harold" is not worthy of his hardly-earned fame: that it approximates far too closely as a whole to the wordy vagueness of "King Arthur;" and that he should study his subject longer, and put forth his undoubted powers with more success when he again appears on the arena of literature. As the first work of a new author, "Harold" might even have commanded a certain admiration; as a romantic chronicle by Sir Edward Bulwer Lytton, it should receive the critic's censure, and be treated with that healthful sternness which reprobates all mediocrity, and more especially the mediocrity of genius.

xvi. *Specimens from Schiller and Uhland. By* George Carless Swayne, *M.A., Fellow of Christ Church College, Oxford.* Oxford: Macpherson. London: Pickering. 1848.

We concluded our former notice by reprobation of mediocrity, and here it confronts us with no little audacity, and after a fashion which, we think, ought to be treated with severity. Schiller is one of the greatest of lyric poets; Uhland, though a weak, is a rather pleasing one. Both are here wronged, though with varying degrees of criminality, by Mr. Swayne, their professed translator. And first, this gentleman has made the most unfortunate selection from Schiller's minor poems; has rendered productions, which even in the original would convey little idea of their author's greatness to the reader's mind. The "Lay" or "Song of the Bell" has, no doubt, much merit of a certain mechanical order: of course, it is sadly travestied in the translation, which is notwithstanding one of the most endurable. But "the Dance" is essentially Germanic and vague; "the Power of Song" is

tiresome and common-place; "the Flowers" little better; "Worth of Woman" *ditto*, the first six lines alone rising above mediocrity; "Laura at the Harpsichord" is in the worst possible taste in the original, despite a certain audacity of form. On the other hand, "die Begegnung" (the meeting) is a charming little poem; and "the Youth at the Streamlet" is one of those unassuming and natural lyrics which achieve greatness, because they do not labour for it. In such poems as "Die Ideale," despite a certain technical power and a certain solidity of purpose, the professor is far more evident than the poet. But, after all, the choice of Mr. Swayne was of little consequence; or rather, his defects are least felt in those poems which are naturally devoid of inspiration. Take one of the most poetical passages of "the Lay of the Bell," as an instance of melancholy failure, which is notwithstanding one of Mr. Swayne's most level passages.

"For where the sturdy and the tender,
Mutual in exact surrender,
Pair, the tone is good in truth;
Ye who for ever fix your state
Prove well, if hearts *amalgamate*,
For brief is passion, long is *ruth*. (?)
In the bridal *lovelocks clearly*
Dallies the garland virginal,
While the church-chimes echoing clearly,
To the blithesome pageant call:
Ah! the queen of festive mornings
Shines the last in May's sweet train,
With the zone and veil's *adornings*,
Life's illusion flies in twain."

How cold and prosaic, and almost unintelligible is this! What idea does it give of such a passage as—

"For kindly stars are ever shining,
Where strength and tenderness combining
Select each other from the throng.
Then let those pause who woo for ever,
And well their hearts to test endeavour!
The dream is short, the penance long.—
Gaily 'mid the bride's dark tresses
Beams the virgin garland fair,
When the priest her union blesses
And the bells her joy declare.
Ah! that hour with rapture laden
Ends life's bright and smiling May:
With the girdle of the maiden
Passes doubt's sweet dream away."

We quote from a version, which is far from satisfying us.—Mr. Swayne's only idea of a poetic translation, is the literal

rendering of word for word: he does not seem to apprehend the possibility of real poetic reproduction, and what he gives us instead, however "true" in a certain sense, must almost always be a parody. We would not call attention to such marvelling absurdities and instances of bad taste, as—

"Whatever for earth's children *under*"—
"Surveys the wide world *cudgel-laden*,"—
"With *torrid* tears his eyes are *bursting*"—
"*Blushes blood the welkin quiet*"—
"Dumb beasts suing, *trapped in ruin*,"
"*Gashes of radiance on infinite space*,"
"The gleaming grape *with deftly winking leer*," &c. &c.

if we could recognize any thing beyond the most hopeless mediocrity in the more level passages. What idea of the force and beauty of the original, for instance, is conveyed by "the Combat" (rather, "the Battle").

"*Hear the rumbling tramp!*
Throbs the level turf their quick march under,
Like a cloud *surcharged* with thunder,
On and on they *stamp.*
Eyes strain'd! teeth set! *to iron hazard-play*
Behold the settling of the grim array.
Glances earthward creep,
And hearts knock ribs in silence, *not of sleep.*
Skull-visaged squadrons, gaunt and wan,
Pass the Major, *who straightens the van.*
Halt!
Regiments *shrink* from the *stark* command;
Fettered and dumb they stand."

How artificial and mechanical, and wholly devoid of impulse, is this! Let us essay, in a free version, to give some little idea of the original:—

"Dark and dreary,
As a tempest cloud,
O'er the vernal meadows they advance:
And the gazing eye grows weary,
As down that endless line of pike and lance
It wanders, scanning o'er the martial crowd.—
Downwards they gaze upon the ground,
And their hearts all wildly beat:
Whilst the Major on his restless steed
Flies down the line; and none are found
Amongst the best and bravest now not pale with fear.
Halt!
At that single word whole thousands pause in their career,
And all is silence round."

Throughout we feel that Mr. Swayne is *working*, but never that he understands or appreciates his original. When he does adorn, his adornments are of the worst English character :—

> " Ask me not that sorrow's reason,
> *Which my morn of life doth pall*"——
> " Ah, the myriad *liquid* voices," &c.

Small things seemingly, and yet destructive of the original's simplicity and beauty. Uhland is wronged, in as far as one of his weakest ballads, which we scarcely had the patience to read through in the original, " The Goldsmith's Daughter," is made the chief sample of his workmanship. The poetry of " the Landlady's Daughter," on the other hand, is lost in the translation :—

> — " I'd love thee, *and date my love from now !*"
> — " I'll love thee *to-morrow, for ever, and aye !*"

The usual artificial stiffness is still felt even here. A little poem, called " Resolution," and some lines " To Her," are really not ill rendered, save that there is an unpleasant awkwardness about the last verse of the former. To place Uhland, however, in this direct apposition with Schiller is most absurd : it is as though a German were to render Shakspeare and " L. E. L." in the same volume. The translator tells us in the Preface, which is lengthy and magniloquent, that, " in the study of Schiller's thoughts and sayings, admiration puts out love," while " in the study of those of Uhland love eclipses admiration ;" and that " Schiller is all fire," while " Uhland is all tenderness." Absurd contrast ! Since one is among the greatest of all times, and the other, at the utmost, a pleasing and, generally speaking, a rather silly rhymester. We suspect, however, that we should not have expended so much critical severity on this little " quasi-poetic" pamphlet, had we not imagined ourselves to recognize the cloven foot of self-conceited and short-sighted rationalism in the closing sentences of the Preface ; a suspicion somewhat strengthened by the dedication of the entire performance to Professor Newman, of the London University. There is much vague profession, indeed, respecting the eternity of religious truth, and its having nothing to fear from any philosophy or literature. Nevertheless, we know that the Germans, as a nation, have been robbed of *their* faith, partly by their poets, and partly by their prosaic sages. In both fields Schiller has been equally reprehensible : witness his mischievous " Resignation" and " Götter Griechenlands," and his equally silly and offensive " Sendung Moses." We would certainly not exclude or denounce German literature, as a whole ; but *he* only can read it with safety, who can at once

pity and despise its vague assertions and insolent negations; who feels that we have left the age of Bolingbrokes and Bayles behind us.

XVII.—*On the Canon of the Scriptures of the New Testament, and on the Apocrypha: Eleven Discourses, preached before the University of Cambridge; being the Hulsean Lectures for the year* 1847. *By* CHRISTOPHER WORDSWORTH, *D.D., Canon of Westminster, &c.* London: Rivingtons.

THIS work demands a far more lengthened notice than our present limits permit us to afford. The question on which it treats is continually rising in importance, in consequence of the efforts of Romanists and of Rationalists, in opposite directions, to sap and undermine all reasonable grounds of belief in the inspiration of Scripture. The former, in their eagerness to establish an implicit faith in the authority of their spiritual rulers, join with unbelievers in denying the Canon of Scripture as established by evidence and tradition. Dr. Wordsworth, in the able and learned work before us, meets the various classes of objections which have been raised against our Canon of the Scriptures, and vindicates the use of the Apocrypha. The mass of evidence which he has brought from the records of the primitive Church to establish the true Canon of Scripture, and in refutation of the Romish or Tridentine Canon, appear to be quite conclusive. We can recommend this work with confidence to any person who wants to make himself master of the subject on which it treats.

XVIII.—*Speculum Episcopi. The Mirror of a Bishop.* London: Edwards and Hughes.

THE author of this work has undertaken an office which will earn him little thanks from that class of persons who look with entire satisfaction on the system which prevails in the discharge of Episcopal duties. The contrast which that system presents to the examples of former times, and the requirements of the Church herself, is described very forcibly and clearly in this volume. We feel assured that the author has done no more than his duty in calling public attention to what the Episcopal office ought to be, and *must* be, if the Church is to be saved. A working clergy alone will not do. We must see a working Episcopate—that is, an Episcopate which is, *in the eyes of the world*, as fully engaged in its *spiritual* duties, as the parochial priesthood. As soon as this is fairly realized, the moral power of the Episcopate will become tenfold what it now is, and they will no longer need to seek

for Acts of Parliament to promote the efficiency of the Church. The Bishop is a successor of the Apostles, not only in authority, but in duties, responsibilities, and in the charge of souls. If he does not make every thing else subordinate to the cure of souls, and the direct advancement of the kingdom of God by preaching, and teaching, and ministering, as the Apostles did, he is neglecting the first and greatest of his duties.

XIX.—*Sermons for Schools and Families, preached in the Chapel of Brighton College. By the Rev.* A. J. MACLEANE, *B.A.* London: Bell.

THIS volume of sermons is of a different stamp from the generality of those which come under our notice. There is a vigour of thought and language throughout, without the slightest extravagance or exaggeration, which gives unusual interest, and must, we think, have rendered them very effective in delivery. There is no far-fetched strain of reasoning, nor any attempt at fine writing in these discourses; but the mind of the reader is directed by a well-managed series of divisions, to the principal doctrines and duties fairly derivable from the passages under consideration. These sermons will afford to the young clergyman excellent examples of the kind of composition which is calculated to render his pulpit ministrations really efficient.

XX.—*The Royal Supremacy over the Church considered as to its Origin, and its Constitutional Limits, &c. By the Rev.* G. E. BIBER, *LL.D.* London: Rivingtons.

SEVERAL recent circumstances have drawn much attention towards the important subject on which this able pamphlet treats, and it has been felt that the Regal Supremacy as actually exercised, is fraught with practical consequences and results capable of deeply affecting the faith and the general efficiency of the Church. In dealing with the Supremacy question, we come at once to the inquiry, whether any sovereign can possess the right of appointing persons of unsound faith or immoral character to the office of bishops or clergy in the Church; or of altogether extinguishing the synods of the Church, and replacing them by Parliament. Such are the powers claimed by men of this world for the temporal sovereign, which amounts simply to the denial of all religious truth. The Erastianism of statesmen in the present day is merely a branch of infidelity: it sets aside the question of religious belief or doctrine as a matter of perfect indifference. The supremacy of the temporal power can only be endangered by putting forward extravagant claims, which make

it a matter of conscience to denounce and resist them. In the excellent pamphlet before us, the various branches of this subject are treated with ability, learning, and high principle.

XXI.—*A Guide to Candidates for Holy Orders. By the Rev.* C. M. MOUNT, *A.M., Prebendary of Wells, &c.* London: Rivingtons.

THE subjects here discussed within the compass of a thin octavo, are the criticism, interpretation, authenticity, credibility, and inspiration of the Bible; the Reformation; contrast between the Church of England and the Church of Rome; and ecclesiastical history in general. It is obvious that the view taken must be a very general one; but we think that the work will be found useful to students, as a recapitulation of points which they must learn more fully elsewhere. The general tone and principles of this work appear to be moderate.

XXII.—*The Combatants: an Allegory. By the Rev.* EDWARD MONRO, *Perpetual Curate of Harrow Weald, &c.* London: Masters.

A BEAUTIFUL allegory, descriptive of the wrestling of the Christian soul against temptations, in the endeavour to win eternal happiness.

XXIII.—*Holy Baptism: a Dissertation. By the Rev.* W. MASKELL, *M.A., Vicar of St. Mary's Church, Devon, &c.* London: Pickering.

THIS work is a very learned systematic treatise on the sacrament of baptism, discussing all the important questions connected with it with very great learning, and with perfect orthodoxy. The treatise is one which ought to be in the hands of every clergyman. Mr. Maskell contends for the validity of lay-baptism, and, we are inclined to think, with somewhat too depreciatory a tone as regards those who have denied or doubted the validity of heretical baptism.

XXIV.—*Divine and Moral Songs for the Use of Children. By* ISAAC WATTS, *D.D., with thirty illustrations, &c.* London: Van Voorst.

THE illustrations in this volume are amongst the most successful both in design and execution that we have seen for a long time. There is a purity and simplicity in the conception of many of them which is really exquisite, and refreshing to the eye and the mind.

xxv.—*Odes of* Klopstock *from* 1747 *to* 1780. *Translated from the German. By* William Nind, *Fellow of St. Peter's College, Cambridge, &c.* London: Pickering.

Klopstock has been peculiarly fortunate in this instance, in falling into the hands of a writer whose poetical genius enables him to give full effect to the tenderness and grace with which these poems abound. There are a thousand beauties in this little volume, from which we extract the following lines, entitled "The Rose Wreath:"—

"I found her by the shady rill,
I bound her with a wreath of vine;
She felt it not, but slumber'd still.

"I look'd on her; and on the spot
My life with hers did blend and close:
I felt it, but I knew it not.

"Some lisping, broken words I spoke,
And rustled light the wreath of rose;
Then from her slumber she awoke.

"She look'd on me; and from that hour
Her life with mine did blend and close;
And round us it was Eden's bower."

xxvi.—*Notes of a Two Years' Residence in Italy. By* Hamilton Geale, *Esq., Barrister at Law.* Dublin: McGlashan.

We are glad to see the Dublin press assuming gradually an increased importance in its literary productions, and capable of presenting volumes so well executed in a typographical point of view as that which is now before us. Mr. Geale is an acute and intelligent observer; and with the exception of his theological views, which are shallow, though on the whole not very objectionable, we can award to his work the character of a very readable book—a volume over which one may spend some hours of positive amusement, and even of instruction. There is considerably more of thought and observation than is commonly met with in volumes of the kind—the only positive defect we can find is, that Mr. Geale's education seems not to have included an accurate drilling in the rather important branch of "orthography." At least we see, here and there, some rather odd specimens of spelling. Such trifling defects, however, are scarcely worth mentioning, and we rise from the perusal of this very agreeable volume with respect for the writer as a scholar, and as a man.

XXVII.—*The Church of England Protestants' Manual of Family Devotion. The humble offering of a Septuagenarian,* WILLIAM POWER HICKS, *a Norfolk Layman.* London: Hamilton, Adams, and Co.

WE are unwilling to speak in any harsh or discouraging way of the labours of this Septuagenarian Norfolk layman, but we should certainly be surprised to meet with any person who could employ this most undevotional Manual of Family Devotion with comfort or profit. It is lengthy, oratorical, and wholly destitute of the spirit of devotion.

XXVIII.—*Scripture Biography. By the Rev.* ROBERT WILSON EVANS, *B.D., Vicar of Heversham, &c.* London: Rivingtons.

THIS volume consists of a series of seventeen biographical sketches of characters in the Old and New Testament history. It seems to us well calculated for bringing the facts of Scripture history in a pleasing and intelligible form before the mind, and we should think it adapted for reading aloud in religious families.

XXIX.—*The Seven Sayings on the Cross; or, the Dying Christ our Prophet, Priest, and King. Being a Series of Sermons preached in St. John's Church, Cheltenham, in the Holy Week,* 1847. *By the Rev.* ALEXANDER WATSON, *M.A., &c.* London: Masters.

FROM all we have seen of this volume of discourses on the Seven Sayings on the Cross, we have been much impressed in its favour. The subject appears to be treated in the devotional tone which becomes it; and the practical and moral reflections which it presents, appear to be sound and well chosen. Without aspiring to any high order of eloquence, these discourses are written with sufficient animation and interest.

XXX.—*An Exposition of the First Seventeen Articles of the Church of England. By the Rev.* THOMAS SWORDE, *M.A., Rector of St. Peter's, Thetford, &c.* London: Parker.

THIS exposition of the Articles is written with so much conciseness, that it cannot enter very deeply into the objects on which it touches. It is a popularly-written volume, and in general its views are sound; but we cannot approve of the author's remarks on the damnatory clauses of the Athanasian Creed, which he would gladly see expunged, though he admits the doctrine of the Creed as necessary to salvation.

XXXI.—*Scenes of* 1792 ; *or, a Tale of Revolution. By the Rev.* G. D. HILL, *M.A.* London : Rivingtons.

To those who have read Lamartine's "Girondists,"—a work which is now brought within the reach of all readers,—the present tale will appear rather heavy and uninteresting. It is a dangerous theme for writers of ordinary powers to venture upon, more especially where they are restricted to such narrow limits as those of the tale before us.

XXXII.—*Via Dolorosa : being the Catholic Devotion of the Stations ; prepared as a special office for the use of English people, &c. Translated and arranged by the Author of "From Oxford to Rome," &c.* London : Longmans.

THIS little volume is very neatly got up indeed ; but the contents are very oddly assorted, and form a truly singular *mélange* of Romanism and Protestantism, which, after all, perhaps, represents, not unfairly, the theological system of the authoress. We cannot conceive any one but a Romanist using this manual of devotion ; and yet even to him there must be much to grate on his feelings in various parts of the work. Altogether the attempt appears to us a peculiarly unfortunate one.

XXXIII.—*The Baron's Little Daughter, and other Tales, in Prose and Verse. By the Author of "The Lord of the Forest and his Vassals," &c.* London : Masters.

THE little volume now before us will be read with pleasure and improvement by young persons. The "Baron's Little Daughter" is very beautifully written, and evinces the possession of poetical powers of no common order. It relates very simply and touchingly the story of a daughter, whose surviving parent is destitute of affection for her, but is at last softened by her love. We have been extremely gratified by all we have seen of this volume.

XXXIV.—*Reciprocal Obligations of the Church and the Civil Power. By* JOHN LOCKHART ROSS, *M.A., &c.* Oxford : J. H. Parker.

THIS work deserves a far more lengthened survey than our present limits permit us to take of it. The subject is one on which the interests of true religion very greatly depend. At present we can only present an outline of the subjects touched on in this volume, recommending to our readers to procure and read the work itself. It commences with an examination of the principle

and necessity of a Church establishment; after which it considers the duty of the State in relation to the Church; the origin and nature of the Church; its proper maintenance and privileges; its duty as an ecclesiastical body in union with the State; the Convocation question, with suggestions for the restoration of a synod; practical remarks on Church extension, and the duty of the State to aid in this cause. On the whole, Mr. Ross's views and suggestions seem to us highly deserving of attention and approbation. We hope to revert to this subject hereafter more at length.

xxxv.—*Family Prayers for Every Day in the Week; intended chiefly for the use of Cottagers. By* Clergymen of the Deanery of Bridport. London: Tegg.

This tract supplies a desideratum—a good set of prayers for family worship adapted to the use of the lower orders. Their style seems not to be above the comprehension of those for whom they are intended. Each service consists of a few verses from Scripture, suitable prayers, ending with the Lord's Prayer, and a short form of thanksgiving. We recommend it to the notice of the clergy.

xxxvi.—*Matutina: Morning Readings selected and original, chiefly practical, and adapted to the use of the younger Members of the Church of England. By the Rev.* George Renaud, *M.A., late Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford.* London: Longmans.

In this work there is a series of short readings or meditations, generally of a practical character, for every day in the year. From what we have seen we are of opinion that the selection is well made, and that the use of it would be found instructive and salutary by educated persons. It is not adapted for any of the middling or lower classes, in our opinion.

xxxvii.—*Conversations on the Church Service. By the Author of "Easy Lessons for Sunday Schools."* London: J. and C. Mosley.

A little book which will be found suitable for a parochial lending library. It gives a simple explanation of the Church service, and in a pleasing way. Teachers in National and Sunday Schools will find it useful.

xxxviii.—*Nimrod; a Dramatic Poem; in Five Acts.* London: Pickering. 1848.

No little has been attempted in this work; and, what is more,

much has been achieved. Lyrical and dramatic powers are indeed not possessed by its author; at least this production contains no evidence of the fact; but, on the other hand, grandeur of conception, and great talents both for narration and description, are here shown, and a general impression conveyed of more than ordinary promise. This work deals with the primeval ages of mankind. The first conqueror, Nimrod, is exhibited to us in his youth, and the progress of ambition in his soul is forcibly pourtrayed. The fourth and fifth acts, however, are in many respects deficient, by no means answering to the expectations which the earlier portion of the work has raised; and thus the latter stages of Nimrod's corruption are but imperfectly brought before us, rather shadowed out than manifestly embodied. The style approximates too closely to that of Byron; and direct reminiscences of "Cain," "Heaven and Earth," "Sardanapalus," and the "Deformed Transformed," occur from time to time both in lyric and dramatic passages. We will refer to one, as an instance of what we mean. Nahmah, the heroine, whose character is sweetly conceived, is first introduced, thus singing,

> "The summer is coming,
> The little birds sing;
> The glad bees are humming," &c.

An evident reminiscence, both in form and matter, of

> "The winter is over,
> The spring is come," &c.

But the lyrics of this author are generally pointless, and often introduced without any apparent purpose. Thus the Songs of the Spirits (pp. 22—24) interrupt the business of the piece most absurdly, and apparently for no other reason than to give the author an opportunity of imitating the songs of the spirits, which are far more aptly introduced in "Manfred" and Shelley's "Prometheus." The character of Abaddona, an angel who neither stands nor falls, is well conceived, and seems to have much originality of purpose. Satan is less well embodied, being a kind of compound of the Lucifer of "Cain," and the Cæsar of "The Deformed Transformed." Notwithstanding, there is much of gloomy grandeur, and even majesty, in the remarkable scene betwixt the Monarch of Darkness and Abaddona, commencing on page 79; and the idea of the final trial by which Omnipotence tested the weakness of rebellion, is solemnly and awfully impressive. The earlier scenes betwixt Nimrod and Nahmah have also much beauty of a humbler order. We will cite, in conclusion,

a single passage from the first temptation of "the Mighty Hunter:"—

Satan. Queller of beasts,
And chief of men.
Nimrod. Stranger, my father lives
In yonder hut, and with my mother shares
My reverence and obedience.
Satan. *Fathers find*
A richer tribute when they bend before
The sons who honour them by greater deeds.
The world advances, and the man to-day
Must view his father as the child in time,
Nearer time's infancy, enlightened less.
The manhood more matured is in himself,
And his sire's merits added to his own
Give him, the son, more honour.
Nimrod. Would'st have me break
The earliest, dearest tie, that raises man
Above the beasts I've slaughtered?
Satan. Honour well
Thy parents, 'tis a law that suits the child.
But would they have thee crouching at their feet?
Be wise, be great, and raise them up with thee;
Then, if thou wilt, kneel down, and merit find
In what is now mere instinct."

A wily temptation, and an apt: filial reverence thus eradicated, what evil might not ensue? We have to complain of an occasional obscurity or apparent absence of distinct purpose, which reminds us from time to time of that clever but displeasing and more than half unintelligible rhapsody, "Pestus." Finally, our advice to the author of "Nimrod" would be, to cultivate his narrative and descriptive powers, and give to the world, not an epic, but, say, various sketches from the primeval ages, each embodying some distinct moral in a poetic tale, and that in such blank verse as Tennyson has chosen for his "Princess," or rather, in that which is natural to the author of "Nimrod," whose versification is at once pleasing and unstudied.

XXXIX.—*Annesley, and other Poems. By* ANNA HARRIET DRURY. London: Pickering.

A QUIET unpretending volume of really sensible poetry. This may not appear great praise; and yet this volume is so conspicuous for its sound sense, its solidity of judgment, and its healthiness of tone, as contrasted with the L. E. L.ism and Mrs.

Nortonism of the day, that we feel bound to call attention first to these, its most characteristic qualities. Its principal poem, "Annesley," is a melancholy and affecting, but very simple tale, of a good clergyman and his fortunes, and may, perhaps, especially recommend itself to the clergy, and their wives and daughters. The minor lyrics which follow have also much merit. "The Death of Elizabeth Tudor" is forcible, though most unjust: "the Battle of Tewkesbury" has much of the old ballad spirit. "The Old Horse to his Mistress," has no little beauty; and two lays, "the Treasures of the Heart," and "the Grave of the Lost," yields promise of a noble harvest yet to come. These few words of praise and encouragement are given from the wish not only to induce some of our readers to make acquaintance with this pleasing poetess, who belongs to the school of Crabbe and Campbell, but also to inspire her to bolder efforts, as we are confident she is capable of greater things. "Annesley," however, has the merit of touching the heart, and this may recommend it to those who "cannot away with" the romantic love-sick strains of the day.

XL.—*The Imperial Dictionary, English, Technological, and Scientific; adapted to the present state of Literature, Science, and Art; on the basis of Webster's English Dictionary, &c. Edited by* JOHN OGILVIE, *LL.D. Vol. I.* Glasgow and London: Blackie and Son.

THIS dictionary, which is publishing in parts, and the first volume of which, in imperial octavo, extends to the end of letter I., and comprises 1100 pages closely printed in three columns, and illustrated with innumerable wood-cuts, very beautifully executed, is by far the fullest and most complete work of the kind that it has ever been our lot to see. Its object is to explain words and terms, which is done with brevity, and with accuracy. We must exempt from our commendation the theological parts of the volume, which breathe throughout the most decided Presbyterianism. It would be impossible to convey any notion of the general character of this work by extracts. The introduction of wood-cuts, which abound in almost every page, is a new feature in a work of this description, and render it so amusing that a person might very pleasantly spend an hour in turning over its pages. The architectural wood-cuts, which are numerous, are very well executed. We shall be glad to see the continuation of this work.

XLI.—*Butler's Three Sermons on Human Nature, and Dissertation on Virtue. Edited by* W. WHEWELL, *D.D., Master of Trinity College, &c.* London: Parker.

DR. WHEWELL has, in this useful edition of Bishop Butler's ethical writings, done much to facilitate the comprehension of this abstruse writer, by careful analysis, and division into paragraphs. We feel assured that students will derive material aid from Dr. Whewell's editorial labours.

XLII.—*Defensio Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ. Auctore* RICARDO CRAKANTHORP, *S.T.P.* Oxonii: apud J. H. Parker.

WE can only direct the reader's attention to this valuable controversial work, in defence of the English Church against Antonio de Dominis, Archbishop of Spalatro, which has been edited by Dr. Wordsworth for the Anglo-Catholic Library. The great importance of this work demands a more careful survey than our present limits permit; but we hope to return to it on some future occasion.

XLIII.—*Predestination and Election vindicated from dependence on Moral Necessity, &c. By* GEORGE MCCLELLAND. Edinburgh: Bell and Bradfute. London: Rivingtons.

THE object of this little work is to assert the doctrine of free-will against Edwards and Dr. Chalmers, to reconcile it with the doctrine of predestination and election, and to refute the Calvinistic doctrines. The author appears to be an acute and profound thinker.

XLIV.—*Sermons preached in the Chapel of Trinity College, Cambridge. By* WILLIAM WHEWELL, *D.D., Master of the College.* London: J. W. Parker.

As far as we have been enabled to peruse the sermons comprised in this volume, they appear to us to be characterized by no very striking features. They are adapted, of course, to a highly-educated congregation; but they are practical in their character. Their language and reasoning are good, and we can speak favourably of the general tone of principle which pervades them.

XLV.—1. *Village Sermons, &c. By* R. D. B. RAWNSLEY, *M.A., &c.* London: Hatchards.

2. *Sermons on Practical Subjects. By the Rev.* SAMUEL WARREN, *LL.D., &c.* London and Edinburgh: Blackwoods.

3. *Sermons on many of the Leading Doctrines and Duties taught by the Church of England. By the Hon.* GEORGE PELLEW, *D.D., Dean of Norwich.* London: Murray.

THE first volume above mentioned contains twenty-four discourses, which appear to be unexceptionable in their teaching, but do not present any features calling for particular observation. They are just the kind of discourses which appear suited to the comprehension of a congregation of very limited intelligence and education.

Dr. Warren's Sermons, on the other hand, are rather ambitious in style, and present more perhaps of the character of finished essays on the subjects of which they treat than is, we think, desirable in pulpit addresses. Yet we doubt not that the truths and the duties which they put forward in vigorous and authoritative language, have been presented in a shape which was well adapted to the congregation to whom they were addressed.

The Sermons by Dr. Pellew are plain, sensible discourses, rather common-place. The only feature that presents itself as worthy of remark is, their uncompromising attitude in reference to Romanism, or whatever the author considers to approximate to it.

XLVI.—MISCELLANEOUS.

A RECENTLY-PUBLISHED work, entitled "Sacro-Politica; the Rights and Relations, Civil and Spiritual, of the Anglican Church," &c., by R. C. Sewell, D.C.L. (Bell), will repay an attentive perusal. This is the first part of a work on the relations of Church and State, and discusses the question of the Royal Supremacy. The writer argues with great ability for the repeal of the Act establishing the Supremacy. "The Principles of the English Constitution in Church and State," &c., by a Lay-Member of the Church of England (Rivingtons), points out ably and well the abuses and evils arising from the appointment to bishoprics having become a branch of Ministerial patronage, instead of being vested in the Crown. "The Oath of Supremacy inconsistent with the Provisions of the Irish Charitable Bequests Act," by the Earl of Clancarty (Ridgway), furnishes additional evidence of the tendency of modern legislation to subvert the Royal Supremacy. It is indeed grossly inconsistent to assert the right to govern all

classes in ecclesiastical matters at one moment, and at the next to concede the claims of those who deny to the State any such power or right.

"Church Leases," &c., by W. H. Grey (Ridgway), is a pamphlet written in furtherance of the views of certain gentlemen who are desirous of obtaining a different tenure for the tenants of Church lands. According to this gentleman's calculations, a large sum might be raised for the cause of Church extension by an arrangement of the kind.

We have to notice some interesting publications received from America, amongst which are, Bishop Doane's Address on the Ends and Objects of Burlington College; Four Sermons on "The Way of the Church with Children," by the same eloquent writer; an Address to the Students of the General Theological Seminary, by Dr. Ogilby; and a Sermon on the Communion of Saints, by Rev. E. M. Johnson.

Of Sermons, we have to mention with high commendation a Visitation Sermon "On Sanctifying Grace, and the Grace of the Ministry," by J. Jackson, M.A., Rector of St. James's, Westminster (Rivingtons). We can also speak favourably of "Sound Education," &c., by the Rev. Thomas Ainger, M.A.; "Four Sermons preached at the General Ordinations of the Lord Bishop of Oxford," &c. (Parker); "The Middle Way, a Sermon," by Rev. R. W. Essington, M.A. (Bell); Two Sermons preached at the opening of the Parish Church of Wellesbourne (Rivingtons). We must not omit to mention an admirable Sermon by the Rev. W. Sewell, of Exeter, "The Danger and Safeguards of the Young in the Present State of Controversy" (Parker).

Recent events in the political world have led to the publication of a Series of Anti-Revolutionary Tracts (Masters), of which some numbers are before us, and apparently well executed. "Sermons for the People" are intended for the same object, of conveying cheap instruction, suited to the crisis.

Of Periodicals, "The Ecclesiologist" continues to maintain its interest and practical value unabated. We can also speak favourably of the "Churchman's Companion," a sixpenny monthly magazine; the "Theologian and Ecclesiastic" (Masters); and "Sharpe's Magazine." The latter is, we think, becoming too exclusively a vehicle for tales of fiction, and approximating too much to other magazines in its character. But it is still a very pleasing publication, and a very cheap one.

Foreign and Colonial Intelligence.

AFRICA.—*Christian Institution at Sierra Leone.*—Six students from this institution have received appointments in the service of the Church Missionary Society. Seven youths from the grammar school were drafted into the institution. The latter now contains nine pupils, the school forty-five. The establishment is in a highly satisfactory state.

AUSTRALIA.—*Arrival of the Bishop of Adelaide.*—Letters have been received from the Church at Adelaide, stating the arrival of the Bishop and Archdeacon on the shores of their new diocese, which they first beheld on board the *Derwent* on Christmas-eve, 1847. They landed on the 4th of January, 1848.

CANADA, DIOCESE OF TORONTO.—*Diocesan Church Society.*—The fifth annual report of the Toronto Church Society states the receipts for last year at 1921*l.* 13*s.* 3½*d.*, exclusive of receipts in the Depository, and of rents for special purposes. In the previous year 1970*l.* 8*s.* were received; the decrease is attributed to the exertions made in the early part of 1847, for the relief of the starving population of Canada.

Gifts of Land for Church purposes.—At one of the recent meetings for current business of the Church Society of Toronto, five votes of thanks were past, for gifts of land to the Society from different individuals; one of which was an entire "lot;" and three of them portions of lots, of 100 acres each. They were given, partly for sites and endowments of local churches, partly for the support of clergymen and missionaries in the diocese, and partly for the general purposes of the Society.

Travelling Missionaries.—In a pastoral issued by the Bishop on the 12th of January last, announcing that the produce of the next of the four annual collections for the Church Society is to be devoted to the travelling missions, it is stated that two clergymen are at present actively employed in the different districts of the diocese, and receive an allowance from the Travelling Mission Fund, besides an interpreter and a catechist. The Bishop further intimates his intention, as soon as the clergymen can be furnished after the next general ordination, to increase the number of the travelling missionaries.

Diocesan Theological College.—Divinity Scholarships.—The Toronto *Church* newspaper contains the following notice:—The Scholarships attached to the Diocesan Theological College at Coburg, by direction of the Lord Bishop of Toronto, will henceforward be divided into three classes:—The first class to comprehend the Scholarships instituted by

the venerable Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, at the rate of 40*l.* sterling per annum ; the second class, chargeable upon the Bishop's Students' Fund, at the rate of 40*l.* currency per annum ; and the third class, chargeable upon the same fund, at the rate of 30*l.* currency per annum. The Scholarships, as thus classed, will henceforward be open for competition, and awarded according to the results of a general examination, to be holden annually at Toronto, by a Board of Examiners appointed by the Lord Bishop of the diocese. The first general examination for this purpose will be held at the Church Society's-house, at Toronto, on Wednesday and Thursday, the 4th and 5th of October next, at ten o'clock, A.M., when two Scholarships in each of the above classes will be awarded according to the merits of candidates. The subjects of examination are fixed as follows :— Gospel of St. Luke, in Greek ; Homer, Iliad, Book XVI. ; Xenophon, Anabasis, Book II. ; Cicero de Senectute; Virgil, Eclogues and Æneid, Book VI. ; Euclid, first four books.—The Scholarships will be tenable for not more than four years, or until ordination ; and the age of candidates must not be under nineteen. Candidates for the Scholarships now announced are required to communicate their intention of offering themselves, to the Rev. H. J. Grasett, M.A., Examining Chaplain to the Lord Bishop at Toronto ; their application to be accompanied with testimonials as to their moral and religious deportment for the three years preceding, and their fitness for the work of the ministry, from at least two licensed clergymen in the diocese in which they reside.

Examination of the Normal School.—The examination of the students at the Normal School took place on Thursday, the 13th of April last, in the presence of the Lord Bishop of the diocese, the Principal of Upper Canada College, and a large company. The examination lasted five hours, and embraced the different departments of Grammar, with the Elements of Logic ; Arithmetic ; the three first books of Euclid, and Algebra, as far as Quadratic Equations ; Geography; Sacred History ; the outlines of History generally ; Mechanics ; Heat and Electricity, and Agricultural Chemistry. The result of the examination is described by the Toronto papers as having been most satisfactory. A large proportion of the pupils entered after the 1st of January, several in February, and some only within two months of the examination. A great majority of them were, previously to their admission, nearly totally ignorant of all the above departments of knowledge.

Clergy Widows' and Orphans' Fund.—The proceeds of the sermon on behalf of the Church Society of the diocese of Toronto, being the first for the seventh year of the Society, appointed to be preached on Trinity Sunday, the 18th of June, were, on the suggestion of the Bishop, to be applied to the support of the widows and orphans of the clergy. At the adjourned meeting, held on the 17th of May, for the final settlement of the Widows' and Orphans' Fund, his Lordship, being desirous that the proposed by-law, for the management of the Widows' and Orphans' Fund, should be submitted for the general consideration of the clergy and laity throughout the diocese, recommended

that no final decision on this subject should be made until after the annual meeting of the Society, which was fixed for Wednesday, June 7; to begin with prayers in the cathedral. The following are the principal provisions of the proposed by-law:—It repeals that portion of the 19th clause of a by-law, passed Oct. 23, 1844, which "provides that the proceeds of one of the annual sermons, which may be appointed by the Lord Bishop to be preached in aid of the funds of the Society, shall be annually invested for the benefit of infirm clergymen and the widows and orphans of clergymen deceased," so far as regards the investing of the proceeds of such collections. It provides, that in each year the interest and dividends of former investments, the collections made under the annual sermon, the annual grant of the Church Society, and any other donation, bequest, or gift, not specially restricted by the donor or testator, shall form part of a fund to be denominated "The Widows' and Orphans' Fund," and shall be considered disposable in each year for the purposes of that fund. And further, it provides, that immediately after the next annual meeting of the Church Society, applications may be received, and aid dispensed from the Widows' and Orphans' Fund, in such cases as may appear to require it; and that the excess in each year of the annual disposable fund above the demands upon it shall, at the end of the year, be added to the permanent fund already accumulated.

Diocese of Quebec.—*Chaplaincy at the Quarantine Station.*—A circular of the Lord Bishop of Montreal, which summons the clergy of the diocese for the 5th of July to the Diocesan Visitation at Montreal, contains an appeal to the clergy for their voluntary co-operation in supplying the functions of chaplain at the Quarantine station; the onus of which, including even their personal expenses, it appears, both the home and the colonial government are suffering to devolve upon the already over-worked clergy of the Colonial Church. The following is the passage of the Bishop's circular on this subject:—

"The time is rapidly approaching at which the services of the Church of England will be required at the Quarantine station at Grosse Isle, situated thirty miles below this city, and (with the exception of one mission, which is at the same distance,) much more remote from any other charge in the diocese.

"Although it is confidently expected that the effect of recent legislative enactments, respecting passenger-vessels, will reduce the emigration to a comparatively small amount, and avert the repetition of such scenes as were witnessed at the station in the summer of last year, yet there will be strangers still coming to make their home with us, and, among that portion of them who will be detained at the island, there will be sick and dying, bereaved and desolate persons, whom (to say nothing of the burial of the dead) it is impossible, for one moment, to think of leaving without the comforting care of the Church and the faithful guidance of her clergy.

"It has, however, so pleased God, that I am at present without the

means of providing a chaplain for this station; and I can, therefore, only hope to meet the exigency by *the voluntary attendance of such of my brethren in succession as shall be enabled, for a short time, to leave their own cures for that purpose.* It is not my intention to suggest to any of them individually the assumption of the task, nor to take the responsibility of judging who, in particular, ought to consider themselves called upon, by the circumstances of their position, to stand forward. I mean, if so permitted, personally to take a share as before in these labours, and other clergymen from Quebec and its immediate neighbourhood will do the same. If you should be prompted to place your services at my disposal in this behalf, you will have the kindness to make an intimation to me accordingly, without delay; and if there is any cause which limits your offer to a particular portion of the season, you will do me the favour of specifying the same.

"I have not yet received from her Majesty's Government in the province, the promised means of *reimbursing those clergymen who were subjected to expenses in the discharge of this duty last year*, and whose accounts I submitted after the close of the operations for the season; but so soon as I shall be enabled to do so, I shall not fail to see that all existing claims of this nature are duly adjusted."

Bishop's College, Lennoxville.—The *Colonial Church Chronicle* contains, on the authority of a private letter, an account of the crippled state of this college, for want of funds[1]. There is no chaplain; only two of the four professors are in holy orders; one of whom is regularly, the other occasionally, engaged elsewhere on Sundays: neither is there a chapel. There is a great want of books, and of a good philosophical apparatus. The salaries of the four professors amount altogether to little more than 500*l.* per annum. The college was opened in September, 1845, with six students. There are now twenty-three on the books, fourteen of whom are in residence. Five students have been admitted to holy orders; and at least as many more will probably be ordained in the course of this year. The regular routine of study includes Divinity, Hebrew, History, Moral Philosophy, Rhetoric, Logic, Classics, Composition, and Mathematics. The present Lecture List exhibits per week seventeen lectures in Classics (as high as Herodotus, Virgil, and Sophocles); one in Logic; six in Mathematics (including Differential and Integral Calculus, and Mechanics); three lectures in Hebrew, and one in Rabbinical Literature, and fourteen more in Divinity; in which appear such books as Barrow on the Supremacy, Hooker, Burnet on the Reformation, and on the Articles; besides Lectures on the Gospels and Epistles.

Cape of Good Hope.—*Arrival of the Bishop.*—The Bishop of Cape Town, with his family, arrived at the Cape of Good Hope on February 20th, after a very favourable voyage of nine weeks. A letter from his Lordship, of the date of March 20th, describes the state of Church

[1] Subscriptions are received at Coutts', Strand, and at the Old Bank, Oxford.

matters in that colony as upon the whole promising. The Bishop had disposed of all his fellow-labourers, and wanted six more—two clergymen, and four catechists. He had ordered sermons for a mission fund to the heathen to be preached in all the churches throughout the diocese. The Governor was giving him a very hearty support.

The Romish Episcopate.—The *John Bull*[2] gives the following intelligence from a colonial paper:—A new Vicar Apostolic has recently been appointed for the eastern part of this colony. The colony of the Cape of Good Hope is now divided into two vicariates, and the eastern province, in which are most of the British settlers and the greater part of the troops, is placed under the episcopal charge of the Right Rev. Dr. Aidan Devereux, Bishop of Paneas, whose consecration took place on Monday, the 27th of December last, in the temporary chapel, Cape Town; the consecrating bishop being the Right Rev. Dr. Griffith, assisted by the Rev. Messrs. Murphy, Griffith, and McCarthy. This is the first consecration of a Romish bishop in South Africa.

Ceylon.—*Mission at Mahara.*—A letter, recently received by the *Society for the Propagation of the Gospel*, from the Bishop of Colombo, dated Feb. 10, 1848, gives an interesting account of the mission at Mahara, which extends over about seventy native villages, with a population of about 37,000 souls, one-third of whom have been baptized many years ago, but long since neglected. There is one dilapidated church, near the principal Buddhist temple of the district at Calamy. Nine schools have been opened there recently, which are attended by nearly 400 children. Temporary buildings have been erected by the natives at twelve different places, where Divine Service is celebrated by the catechist on alternate Sundays. Subscriptions are in progress for four small churches along the high-road from Colombo to Kandy. For these the natives themselves have given land, and offer materials and labour with much good-will. Education, they say, is their want; they are willing to build schools, which, when built, will be available also for strictly religious purposes.

China.—*Mission at Hong Kong.*—Associations in connexion with the *Societies for Promoting Christian Knowledge*, and *for the Propagation of the Gospel*, have been established at Victoria, Hong Kong. The erection of St. John's Church, at Victoria, is progressing satisfactorily. It affords accommodation for 750, and, if necessary, one hundred might be added. The whole is probably roofed in by this time.

American Episcopal Mission.—Bishop Boone, the American missionary bishop at Shanghai, has sent in a report to the General Convention, from which the following are extracts:—

"When at Hong Kong, by request of the Rev. V. Stanton, British chaplain, I confirmed sixteen persons. At Shanghai I have bap-

[2] We perceive with pleasure, that the *John Bull*, under its new management, devotes a portion of its columns to the collection of interesting ecclesiastical and religious intelligence, both at home and from abroad.

tized five infants and one adult. The latter is the first-fruits of our mission from among the Chinese. The Lord's Supper is administered on the first Sunday of every month at my house. The present number of communicants is seventeen. Public service is held at the British consulate every Sunday, by the Rev. Mr. McClatchie, a missionary of the Church of England, Mr. Syle, and myself. A parish has been recently organized at this place, under the name of Trinity Church, Shanghai; and a rector is expected to arrive early in the next year from England. At the request of the British consul I drew up the resolutions, passed at the public meeting for organizing the parish; and I was requested to act on the committee for superintending the building of the church, and also on that for writing to England for a clergyman. The church we hope to have completed in six months. Our school continues to prosper. It numbers at present thirty-two. The Sunday services for the Chinese are sustained. Last year I translated, from the Prayer Book, the Morning Service, the Baptismal and Confirmation Offices, and the Service for the Administration of the Holy Communion. I prepared, also, a catechism for the use of candidates for baptism. I have had a correspondence with the *Prayer Book and Homily Society* of England, on the subject of a translation of the Book of Common Prayer into the Chinese language, to be used by both the missionaries of the English and American churches."

Later accounts, to the 18th of November, 1847, speak discouragingly of the health of Bishop Boone. The church mentioned by the Bishop, spacious school-buildings, and some dwellings for the missionaries, were to be erected in 1848; the British consul, R. Alcock, Esq., taking an active part in conjunction with the American Bishop. Unfortunately the Committee have no other way of raising the funds for building a church and parsonage than by selling fifty pews at 200 dollars each. The *Church Missionary Society* is to be applied to for a clergyman of the Church of England to undertake the charge.

France.—*Position of the Romish Clergy.*—The pleasant understanding which had taken place at the beginning of the French revolution between the Romish clergy and the Republic, has already ceased to exist. We noticed in our last the first symptoms of antagonism[3] between the democracy and the priesthood; the occasions of dissension have since become more numerous. Unpopular priests have been summarily ejected from their parishes; religious houses have been ransacked, and their inmates driven away; and numberless collisions have taken place on a variety of points between the clergy, who make the republic their plea for doing whatever they list, and the civil authorities of the republic, who consider themselves at perfect liberty to dispense both with the letter and the spirit of the law, whenever they deem that course expedient for the public weal. The tone of feeling which subsists

[3] See our last Number, pp. 248—252.

between the two parties may be gathered from the correspondence which has recently passed between the Bishop of Viviers and the Commissaries of the *département de l'Ardèche*, in consequence of repeated collisions which had taken place. The Commissaries wrote to the Bishop, requesting of him that he would exhort his clergy to show more devotion and confidence towards the republic. The Bishop, in his reply, after promising to act upon their suggestion, thus continues:— "I venture, on the other hand, to request you, gentlemen, to consider in your wisdom, whether in the interest of that union which we have both at heart, it would not be expedient that you should give some admonitions to the *maires* of the *communes*. Among those honourable gentlemen, there are some occasionally to be found, who consider all things lawful to them, especially under the government of the republic. Among those recently appointed, I know of some who inaugurated their new functions by dismissing the functionaries of the Church, and appointing others in their places; by making violent changes in regard to the sittings of the sanctuary, although the law places these matters under the authority of the incumbent, or the Church committee. A few days ago, I received a letter from a *maire*, who requires to have at once both the incumbent and the curate changed. The two priests in question are among the most virtuous and the most conciliating of my clergy. The demand is couched in haughty and menacing terms, indicating a violent and hasty character. If this magistrate makes use of such language towards the chief pastor, what will he not do towards poor country clergymen. You must clearly perceive, gentlemen, that my exhortations to the clergy would be of no use, if the *maires* were to take it into their heads that under the republic they are absolute masters in the Church as well as in the parish. An instruction to them, recommending them not to interfere in religious matters; to show themselves, and cause others to show, respect for the ecclesiastical office; to evince in their communications with the clergy, regard, kindness, and a spirit of conciliation, would have an excellent effect, and would secure the effect of my own exhortations to the clergy."

The state of feeling which this letter indicates, is by this time pretty general. The ostentatious participation of the clergy in the republican demonstrations has long ceased; they began themselves to be ashamed of the farce which they enacted with the trees of liberty, when they found that they had to repeat the performance times out of number; and the programme of the grand *fête* in honour of the republic, which assigned to the archbishop and the clergy of Paris their places at the tail of the procession, after a series of fantastic exhibitions and heathenish emblems, was so manifestly degrading to religion, that the archbishop signified to the government, that he and his clergy must decline to form part of the pageant.

While the clergy thus stand aloof from the republic in these matters, the republican authorities and the leaders of the democratic party are opposed to another kind of pageants which the Romish priesthood are

most anxious to set on foot. Popish processions are, according to the existing law, forbidden, except with the special licence of the civil authority, which is not to be given in places in which there is a Protestant consistory, nor in any other instance in which disorders might be apprehended in consequence. But the clergy maintain that this law is obsolete; that under the republic there must be perfect liberty of worship, of which the liberty of walking in procession is an essential part. Numerous are the contentions that have already arisen upon this point: the most recent and most serious of them is an affray which took place on Whitsunday at Toulouse, when the clergy, having the populace on their side, marched through the town in procession, with a tricolour banner at their head, bearing the inscription, *Liberté des Cultes.* The democratic clubs became outrageous, and the two parties came to open blows in the streets; but the Popish party had the best of it, and the procession was continued after a stoppage of an hour and a half. If the clergy should carry into effect their present intention to try the question very generally throughout France, on the approaching feast of *Corpus Christi*, there is every reason to apprehend serious collisions.

Meanwhile matters of yet greater importance than local squabbles about parish priests and religious houses, and the opposition pageantry of the heathenish republic and the idolatrous Church, are being brought to an issue. The question of the maintenance of the clergy by an annual charge on the budget will be brought under discussion; and the question of ecclesiastical patronage, and especially of appointment to the episcopate, has already been raised. Two remarkable documents, bearing on both these questions, have found their way into the public prints: one a brief of Pope Pius IX. to the Apostolic Nuncio at Paris, on the ecclesiastical affairs of France; the other a letter from M. Thiers, who, from being the most violent opponent of the clergy under the old *régime*, has, under the republic, unexpectedly become their advocate and patron. As both these documents are not only important in themselves, but calculated to throw great light upon the position and prospects of Romanism in France at this moment, we shall transfer them to our pages.

Brief of Pope Pius IX. to the Apostolic Nuncio at Paris.—"To his venerable Brother, Raphael, Archbishop of Nicæa, Nuncio Apostolic, Pius IX., Pope, sends greeting, and his apostolic benediction.—It has been no small consolation to us to learn, from your letter to the cardinal secretary of state, that the faithful people of France have, during the recent political changes in that country, generally exhibited marks of veneration and of devotion towards our most holy religion. Nor did it afford us less pleasure to learn that the clergy themselves, mindful of their vocation and ministry, did all that lay in their power to secure tranquillity and to prevent bloodshed. As soon as we were informed of this, we could not but offer, in all humility of heart, our thanks to God for it. And, above all, it was satisfactory to us, venerable Brother, to learn from the same letter how judiciously and wisely you answered those who, in the present state of the government of that nation, wished

to raise in the public prints, for the defence of the liberty of the Church, a discussion on matters of the gravest import, which belong exclusively to the supreme authority and judgment of ourselves and this apostolic see. The fact is, that the Roman pontiffs, to whom the care and charge of all the churches is committed by God, have never ceased, according to circumstances, to protect the liberty of the Church in France, and to resist the endeavours of those who attempted to undermine this liberty in that country. Thus Pius VII., our predecessor of blessed memory, with apostolic freedom and fortitude, boldly rejected the organic articles as soon as they were published, in regard to all those things which were contrary to the doctrine and the laws of the Church; and, subsequently, both he and other our predecessors have used every diligence and exertion to promote the liberty of the Church and the spiritual welfare of that nation.

"At any rate, the canonical discipline, and the regulations respecting sacred things, now in force in the French churches, cannot be changed by any one but the Roman pontiff, since no one else has general authority over all the episcopal and metropolitan churches of the French dominions; and it can never be lawful for any one to determine any thing on subjects connected with the general discipline of the Church, or to abrogate those things which have been established with the sanction of this apostolic see.

"As regards the revenues appointed for Divine service, and for the sacred ministry, it is known to every body that this kind of endowment is but a small compensation for the vast properties of the Church, which have in former and most sad times been alienated in that country. To renounce that endowment would be to bring religion itself into great jeopardy, as it would deprive the clergy of their necessary stay and support; especially as in some towns, and in most of the smaller places in France, the poverty of the people is so great, that they are quite unable to contribute to the support of the Church and the clergy. And for this cause, several Bishops can hardly manage to maintain their clerical '*petits séminaires*,' and are unable to establish additional ones as they could wish to do, as being most necessary for extending the education of their clergy and increasing their numbers. There would be reason, therefore, to apprehend that the dearth of clergy, already so sensibly felt in the French churches, would become still more pressing, to the great injury both of religion and of souls.

"It is true, that in the United States of America, the Catholic faith is, with God's help, daily enlarging its borders; yet would it have borne far more abundant fruit if the number of the native clergy had been adequate to the numbers and the spiritual wants of the people; which, to the extent required, is impossible for want of seasonable and sufficient supplies.

"We have thought it fit to write thus much to you, venerable Brother, that you may communicate the same to whom you shall, according to your judgment, in the Lord, see fit to do so. And while we bestow on you just praise for having most ably discharged your most

difficult office, we trust that you will, with the same prudence, zeal, and judgment, continue to exhort and to admonish, especially clergymen, sincerely to consider, that the Church, as St. Innocent I., our predecessor, most wisely said, is not to be changed according to the fickleness of human things; and therefore to be extremely careful not to do, through excessive zeal, in a hasty and precipitate manner, any thing that might be injurious to the Church, and grievous to ourselves. We, emulating the illustrious example of our predecessors, shall not fail, as becometh our office of Supreme Apostolate, to adopt, according to times and circumstances, such measures as we shall deem to be most conducive, in the Lord, to the safety of the Church, and to the spiritual welfare of that nation. And we have not the least doubt that our venerable Brethren, the Bishops of France, from whom we have received so many striking proofs of their veneration and devotion towards us and this chair of St. Peter, as well as the clergy and the faithful people in that nation, who have always shown themselves to be animated by singular zeal for the Catholic religion, will with yet greater alacrity carry themselves in such a manner, that the worship and splendour of that holy religion may thereby be increased daily more and more. Lastly, receive as an earnest of our singular affection for you, our Apostolic benediction, which from our very heart we bestow upon you in perpetuity, venerable Brother.

"Given at Rome, at St. Maria Maggiore, March 18, 1848, and in the second year of our Pontificate."

Letter of M. Thiers on the Ecclesiastical Affairs of France.—This letter, addressed to "Mr. M. de M., late deputy," is dated "Paris, May 2, 1848," and runs as follows:—

"My dear M., my opinion on your most weighty questions of the present moment is this. You are aware of the usual tenacity of my political, social, and financial opinions; you know how little taste I have for a deputy's life; and you may therefore be well satisfied that I would not sacrifice a single one of my notions to the electoral multitude. But I am sometimes annoyed to see what silly opinions some of your friends impute to me, in reference to the clergy: it seems to me, that, after reading what I have written on the Concordat, they ought to have a little more insight into my real principles.

"At any rate, the revolution of February would have changed many things in this respect; and could leave no doubt on points on which some doubt might have existed. I have always thought a positive religion, a worship, and a clergy necessary; and I have thought that the most ancient thing of the kind is the best, as well as the most respectable. Now that all social ideas are perverted, that we are to have in every village a phalansterian schoolmaster, I regard the parish priest as an indispensable rectifier of the ideas of the people; he will at least teach them, in the name of Christ, that suffering is necessary in all conditions of life; and that, when poor people are afflicted with fever, it is not the rich that have sent it to them.

"Without salary, there can be no clergy. Many Catholics are

under a mistake on this point, and imagine that, by renouncing the salary, they will be emancipated from State bondage. All they will be emancipated from, is the trouble of drawing their salary; and there their freedom will end. The yoke will be an iron yoke for them as well as for us all, and they will die of starvation in a state of aggravated bondage.

"Let this be taken as a fact, that in nine-tenths of France the priests would be left to starve. Perhaps in the Vendée they might be supported; possibly, too, large proprietors might form a fund of some millions (though I much doubt it), and Heaven knows what would become of these millions!!! I have told you, my dear M., these two months—*Upon this system we should reduce France to the level of Ireland.*

"As for liberty of instruction, I am changed, not by a revolution in my principles, but by a revolution in the social state. While the University represented the good and sensible *bourgeoisie* of France, while it taught our children upon the methods of Rollin, and gave the preference to sound old classical studies over the physical and altogether materialistic studies of the promoters of professional instruction, I was, indeed, prepared to sacrifice to it the freedom of instruction. I am so no longer, and why? because nothing is in the state in which it was. The University falling into the hands of the phalansterians, professes to teach our children a little mathematics, and physical and natural science, and a great deal of demagogism; I therefore see no salvation, if there is any, except in the liberty of instruction. I do not say that it ought to be absolute, and without any guarantee to the public authority; for after all, if there was a *Carnot* system, and beyond it a *Blanqui* system of instruction, I should be glad to have it in my power to stop at least the latter! But in any event, I repeat that the instruction of the clergy which I disliked, appears to me now to be better than that which is in store for us.

"This is my way of thinking about all these matters. I am the same man I ever was; but I direct my hatred and my zealous resistance only where the enemy now is. That enemy is demagogism; and to it I will not sacrifice the last fragment of social order, that is, the Catholic establishment.

"If this had to be printed, I should work up the argument more powerfully and in better language; there will, however, be no indiscretion in communicating it privately to friends; all I object to is its being printed; for I like to be more careful of my *toilette* before I appear in public."—THIERS.

Revolution in the French Protestant Communions.—The two Protestant Communions of France have undergone revolutions scarcely less violent than that which has befallen the body politic; every thing is reduced to a provisional state. The news of the revolution at Paris had scarcely reached Strasburg, when a number of members of the Lutheran Communion, who had long been dissatisfied with the government of the "Central Directory of the Confession of Augsburg," met together, and

having obtained the resignation of the two remaining members of the Directory (a third being absent at the time from ill health, and two seats being vacant, one by death, the other by resignation), they appointed a Provisional Directorial Commission, for the transaction of all the current business of the Directory, and for preparing "a project of reconstitution of the Confession of Augsburg in France, upon the recognized basis of the ancient Church, that is, of the sovereignty of the general body of the faithful." The Provisional Directorial Commission so appointed, has placed itself in communication with the local Lutheran consistories throughout France, and as soon as the project is completed, will take measures for the convocation of a new general consistory, which will be the constituent assembly of the Lutheran Communion.

In the Reformed or Calvinistic Communion, the progress of revolution has been, if possible, still more rapid. A general cry for reorganization, raised almost simultaneously with the revolution, was responded to by the appointment, in eighty-six out of ninety-two "Consistorial Churches," of delegates to a constituent assembly, which met accordingly at Paris, where it held its sittings from the 10th to the 25th of May. By the admission of their own prints, the debates were of the most disorderly and, occasionally, violent character. The first difficulty arose in the verification of the powers of the delegates. As the election had been conducted without any electoral law whatever, the proof of their authority to represent their "Churches" was, in the case of many of the delegates, of the most questionable kind; but as the assembly had no rule or principle to guide it, all were admitted, even those who were accredited only by their own affirmation that they were the "natural representatives" of their "Churches." After much discussion on the mode of conducting its business, the assembly at last came to the conclusion that they were not a sufficiently constituted representation of the "reformed Churches;" and that, therefore, they ought to confine themselves to the drawing up of an electoral law, preparatory to the convocation of "a general assembly of the reformed Churches in France." The principles of this electoral law are of the most democratic kind; we have not room to enter into any details as to its provisions, or the debates which took place in its preparation. To show the character of the movement, as well as the actual condition of these "Churches," it will be sufficient to quote from the session of the 20th of May the different tests proposed for defining Church membership, and the consequent right to vote in the approaching elections. The following tests were successively proposed: "To be baptized, a communicant, and to believe that Jesus Christ is God manifest in the flesh;" negatived:—to substitute for the words "that Jesus Christ is God manifest in the flesh," the words "that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God;" negatived:—to substitute adhesion to the Apostles' Creed; negatived:—to retain only baptism and communion, without any expression of belief; negatived, on the ground that many of their Church members, nay, even of the members of their consistories, *never* receive the communion:—to rest satisfied with

baptism and the first admission to the communion; negatived, on the ground that numbers have never communicated at all:—to let baptism be the only test; negatived, on the ground that there were unbaptized Church members who ought not to be excluded:—to require that the electors should take part in "the essential acts of religion;" negatived, on the ground of its being too indefinite. The resolution ultimately agreed upon was, "that all shall have a vote who declare that they heartily belong and adhere to the reformed Church of France." After settling the electoral law upon this wide basis, the assembly appointed a "provisional commission" to undertake "the care of all the Churches," till the new assembly can be convoked. An attempt was made to effect a fusion between the Lutherans and the Calvinists; but it led to nothing but the unanimous adoption of a resolution in the latter assembly, to the effect that the union of the two communions, if possible, would be desirable: a proposition on which one of the speakers remarked, that "Satan alone could refuse his adhesion to it."

Germany.—*New Church Constitutions.*—The King of Prussia has issued his edict for the election of deputies to a general assembly of the Protestant Church in Prussia, which is to settle "the future constitution of the Church." On the other hand, the "friends of light" convoked a general assembly of their own, which met at Köthen (of rationalistic notoriety) on the Wednesday in Easter week, under the presidency of Uhlich of Magdeburg, when a programme, prepared by a "commission," was adopted by a large concourse of persons, which, being too numerous to be contained within any building, had to adjourn to the open air. The programme defines the "Church" as "the congregation of Christians, animated by the spirit of Christ, which is a spirit of liberty and of love." Positive doctrines are repudiated as inconsistent with the free development of the Church's life. Each particular congregation is to consist of "those who keep to one and the same meeting-house."

India. Diocese of Calcutta.—*Society for the Propagation of the Gospel.*—An appeal has been issued under the sanction of the Bishop, in the name of the Calcutta Diocesan Committee of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, by the Rev. Professor Street, the secretary, for raising the sum of 2000*l.* annually, to defray the expenses of the missions connected with the Society in the diocese of Calcutta. Besides the claims which the Society has, on the ground of its end and aim being the glory of God in the extension of the knowledge of His salvation, the Professor urges that it is the most ancient Society of our Church for directly missionary purposes, and that it has been its constant rule and endeavour to hold fast the fellowship and doctrine of the Apostles, by conducting its operations in direct connexion with the whole body of Bishops. In enumerating its special claims on the diocese of Calcutta, the appeal instances the establish-

ment of Bishop's College, and of the missions connected with it; the erection of churches and maintenance of missions; and the endowment of a canonry in the cathedral of Calcutta.

Bishop's College, Calcutta.—There are at present twenty-three students resident within the college; of whom seventeen, intending to devote themselves to the ministry of the Gospel, are maintained at the Society's sole cost. The following are the missions in connexion with Bishop's College:—1. Tallygunge; 2. Howrah; 3. Barripûr; 4. Mogra Hât; 5. Tamlook; 6. Cawnpore; 7. Saugor (to the Gonds of Central India); 8. the Rev. K. M. Banerjea's Schools in Calcutta; 9. the Calcutta Hindustani Mission. In these missions there are at present employed twelve missionaries and five catechists, besides numerous native Christians engaged as schoolmasters and readers. In the three first-named missions, Christian Orphan Schools are maintained on the mission premises; and at Cawnpore the Asylum for Native Female Orphans has, from the first, been the nucleus of the mission.

Diocese of Madras.—*Native Clergy.—Schools.*—A letter addressed by Archdeacon Shortland to the *Madras Christian Intelligencer* gives the following pleasing account of the mission at Secunderabad, under the charge of a native clergyman, the Rev. N. Parenjody:—"The schools of the mission, Tamil and Telugoo, are scattered over the station of Secunderabad, and extend to Bolarum, and the residency at Hyderabad. Their instruction is, at present, exclusively religious; children of all classes and castes, Mahomedan as well as Hindoo, read and are examined and catechized in the Holy Scriptures.

"These schools were formed, and have been brought to their present state, by the unassisted labour of a native clergyman; the very funds by which they are supported, and by which the school-rooms also were built, having been entirely raised by him on the spot, without the smallest grant from the Diocesan Committee. He is anxious to establish a Hindoostanee school, which is one of the principal languages spoken in the Nizam's country, but does not possess funds for this purpose."

Italy.—*Critical State of Church Affairs*[4].—The Jesuits have been expelled from the whole of the Italian territories. The Pope has issued a circular to the Archbishops, Bishops, and others charged with the supervision of religious publications, laying down rules for the exercise of a canonical censorship over religious books, rendered necessary by the provisions of the recent Constitution, by which the freedom of the press, with the reservation of religious publications, is established. A concordat has been concluded with Tuscany, adapted to the new state of things in Italy.

[4] The great press of intelligence, at this moment, from every quarter, does not permit us to enter into further details. The most important part of the intelligence from Italy will be found embodied in Article I. of the present Number, entitled "The Papacy and the Revolution," to which we refer our readers for the completion of this department of our intelligence.

Jerusalem.—*A Mahomedan preaching to Christian Bishops.*—Mustapha Sheriff, the Pacha of Jerusalem, convened the Latin, Greek, and Armenian Patriarchs, with their respective staff of clergy, in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre on the 15th of March, when he harangued them in the Turkish language, inculcating peace, concord, and harmony, in order to set a good example to the people; and concluded by saying, that they ought to do this for the love of Jesus Christ, before whose sepulchre they were. Peace was made, and the Latin Patriarch said to the Pacha, "I congratulate myself that your Excellency being at Jerusalem, to administer justice, you made yourself the conciliator of peace between Christians—an office of the greatest honour and highest glory."

Mauritius.—*State of the Mission.*—The *Colonial Church Chronicle* contains an extract from the letter of a naval officer, giving an account of this mission, from which we abridge the following:—"There are but four clergymen in the island, including the military chaplain. The population is a mixture of French, English, Coolies from Bengal, and Creoles, which last are the native inhabitants; they amount altogether to about 160,000, of which there may be about 2000 belonging to the Church of England, exclusive of the soldiers. There is one church in the town of Port Louis, which was formerly a powder-magazine: this is served by one of the colonial chaplains. Another church has been built by subscription, at the west end of the island, where it is much wanted. This is served by the second colonial chaplain, who lives at Port Louis, about twenty-five miles from it. There is another church in progress at Moka, a district which includes the governor's country-house, and near the houses of several of the principal merchants. There is no prospect of any clergyman at present for this. There is a military station at Mahèbourg, about thirty-two miles from Port Louis: the military chaplain going over there once a month from Port Louis, on a Sunday, to do the duty. There was some mention of a subscription being raised for a church at this place. Much might be done at the Mauritius, if there were a sufficient number of missionaries, with the Coolies, of whom there are upwards of 50,000, employed in the sugar plantations. After remaining a few years on the island, they go back to Bengal, as soon as they have earned a certain sum of money. They lose caste on leaving their own country; so that this obstacle, the great one in India, is obviated in their case. There is a Roman Catholic Bishop at the Mauritius, a Jesuit, a young and most polished man; he is an Irishman. The Romanists there subscribe to our churches."

New Brunswick.—*State of the Diocese.*—We extract the following from a statement published by the Bishop of Fredericton, during his short visit to this country, respecting the condition and wants of his diocese:—"There are several entire counties without a single clergyman. One of my clergy has a district of 120 miles to travel over, with 2 churches; another has 90 miles, with 3 churches. Two others have three services on Sunday, and each travels 25 miles. Opposite

to these clergymen is a settled district of 80 miles without a pastor of our Church. Several have four churches to serve. These journeys must be performed in all weathers, of the coldest as well as the hottest kind; for the extreme range of our thermometer varies from 100° in summer to 25° and occasionally even 30° below zero in winter.

"The income of our Church Society (established by the Archdeacon of the province twelve years since) amounts to about 1000*l.* It is a Bible, Missionary, Prayer Book and Homily, Church and Parsonage-building, and Religious Tract Society, all in one. It made the following grants at its annual meeting in February, 1848:—Towards the support of missionaries, 500*l.*; for gratuitous distribution of books, 200*l.*; for books on sale, 300*l.*; in aid of churches to be built, 150*l.*; in aid of parsonage-houses, 100*l.*; and to a fund for widows and orphans of the clergy, and similar purposes, 100*l.* By means of the grants to missions, 27 churches and stations were served during the past year, which would otherwise never have been occupied."

New Zealand.—*Supply of Clergy educated in the Diocese.*—A letter addressed by the Lord Bishop of New Zealand to the *Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts*, dated December 17, 1847, contains the following interesting particulars:—

"We have lately received a large accession to our clerical body by the ordination of three collegiate deacons, all of whom are in connexion with the *Society for the Propagation of the Gospel.* The ordination of the collegiate deacons was a most interesting occasion. Our Native and English schools sat in front of the communion table, and conducted the singing. The whole church (St. Paul's, Auckland,) was crowded with a most attentive congregation. Thirteen clergymen, including the five who were ordained, partook of the Holy Communion. The college is now beginning to discharge its duty of ministering to the neighbourhood. In a new colony the proportion of sick and aged persons is very small, and therefore the Sunday ministrations form a larger share of the whole duty of a clergyman than they do in England. This is peculiarly favourable for the working of a collegiate system, where the college duties occupy the greater part of the week, and the Sunday is devoted to the care of the college chapelries. Each of these districts now visited from the college will be formed gradually, I hope, into a separate parish, and will be fully organized, with a resident clergyman, when the deacon now in charge is admitted to the priesthood. This is the plan which is now in progress at Auckland, but I fear the same process cannot be carried on at the other settlements until colleges on a similar plan can be formed in them."

Close combination of Education with the Clerical Office.—The *New Zealand Church Almanack* for 1848, contains many admirable regulations for the government of the diocese, among them the following on the subject of education:—

"The deacons are allowed to take private pupils, to be educated during the hours not occupied in the school. The archdeacons and

senior clergy, upon recommendation of the deacons, are at liberty to recommend scholars from the parochial schools, to be received by the deacons into their class of private pupils, from which the candidates for scholarships at the diocesan colleges will be selected by the Bishop or examiners appointed by him. It is hoped, that the direct way to the ministry of the Church will thus be opened to every young man of piety and worth, in whatever rank of life he may have been born.

"The great importance of the diocesan system of education, in its bearing upon all the highest interests of the country, requires that it should be clearly understood from the first, that no deacon can be admitted to the order of the priesthood, whatever may be his qualifications, who shall have neglected the schools committed to his charge. For the same reason, the surest way by which a candidate for holy orders can recommend himself to the notice of the Bishop will be, by diligence and skill in the management of a school. No permanent distinction will be drawn between the offices of clergyman and schoolmaster. Every clergyman must be also a schoolmaster, and it is the object of the diocesan system to provide, that every schoolmaster shall become a clergyman. The great point to be kept steadily in view is, to sanctify the work of teaching, by connecting it, in act or in hope, with the ministry of the Church of Christ."

State of the Population on Stewart's Island.—In a letter addressed by Captain Brown from New London to a Sandwich Island paper, the following gratifying account is given of the state in which he found the population on Stewart's Island:—

"The natives of New Zealand who reside on Stewart's Island are fast becoming Christianized. They are very strict in their observance of the Sabbath. They will not even go into their gardens to get a potato to broil on the Sabbath, but always prepare enough on Saturday to last until Monday, and if they fall short go without. All the white residents here were formerly sailors, sealmen and whalemen. There are no rum shops. I must acknowledge that many of them in behaviour are far superior to the majority of people in any other part I ever visited; they seemed to be much pleased with our religious meetings, always attending whenever the weather would permit, coming sometimes ten miles. I distributed all the religious books I had, among them, which they seemed to be eager for; and a large number of tracts. They felt much the want of Bibles, and I was very sorry we had no more to part with."

Nova Scotia.—*Annual General Meeting of the Diocesan Church Society.*—On Wednesday, the 15th of March last, the annual meeting of the Diocesan Church Society of Nova Scotia was held at Halifax. His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, Sir John Harvey, in the chair.

His Excellency, in his opening remarks, urged "upon all, who professed themselves members of the Church of England throughout the province, the necessity of solemnly pledging themselves, with every

adult member of their families, to the annual contribution towards its support, of some specific sum, however inconsiderable in amount, to be paid with undeviating punctuality, at such period as may best suit the convenience of each, but under no circumstances other than those of extreme distress to be withheld. The Governor observed, in support of this proposition, that the Church of their affections would ere long have to rest its sole dependence upon such voluntary contributions; and as their amount would be self-imposed, it would be open alike to rich and to poor, to evince the sincerity of their desire to sustain the glorious fabric of their faith, and even to transmit it in a more strengthened, embellished, and improved state to their descendants."

In the report, the whole amount of contributions for the year was announced to be 534*l.* 18*s.* 4½*d.*, not including the contributions in Halifax, which this year were postponed till after the meeting. The increase on country contributions was 70*l.* The Lord Bishop in the course of his address to the meeting stated, that there were 111 churches now in Nova Scotia, only two of which were in existence within his recollection. Among the resolutions, the following two were the most important:—

"That while we rejoice in the success which has attended the labours of our first visiting missionaries, and desire to express our gratitude to God, we trust it will serve as an effective call for the increased exertions of the Church throughout the province to send forth more labourers into the harvest.

"That as the Church must mainly depend for labourers in the Lord's Vineyard upon the supply to be derived from the college at Windsor, this meeting hails with gratitude the munificent offers of the *Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge*, to which we are already so largely indebted, in so liberally responding to the call of the Right Rev. the Visitor addressed to them on behalf of the institution, and calls upon the members of the Church at large to give their liberal aid to the exertions now making by them, the Bishop, and the incorporated Alumni on its behalf."

Polynesia.—*Abandonment of the Romish Mission in New Caledonia.*—The Roman Catholic mission in New Caledonia was abandoned on the 20th of July last. The Bishop of Antiphille, a priest and four others, were received on board the French corvette "La Brillante," off Poeto. In escaping from the attack of the savages at Balade, they left behind them one of their number, Brother Blaire.

Seychelles Islands.—*Statistics of the Mission.*—A letter from the missionary of the Seychelles Islands, the Rev. F. G. Delafontaine, to the *Society for the Propagation of the Gospel*, gives the following topographical account of his mission. The group of the Seychelles consists of more than ten islands, the population of which is as follows:—

Mahé, the principal island of the group			5000 inhabitants.
La Digne	21 miles from Mahé		350 „
Praslin	21 „	„	250 „
Silhouette	15 „	„	200 „
Curieuse (a lazaretto for lepers)	24 „	„	80 „
Frégate	30 „	„	25 „
Other small islands			55 „
Total			5960

Mahé is about thirty miles in length, and from three to eight in breadth, the whole island being a mountain, the highest summit of which is 3000 feet above the level of the sea. One may visit the different districts of the island either by crossing over the mountain by the worst paths you can imagine, or by sea in small piroques.

"It is impossible," says the missionary, "for me to extend my regular labours beyond the town of Victoria and its immediate neighbourhood; and I have found by experience that rare and irregular visits to the other parts of the Archipelago are of no avail. Besides, our population will not come spontaneously under religious instruction: they must be sought for, and this I cannot do alone." The necessity of some further provision is self-evident.

Turkey.—*American Episcopal Mission at Constantinople.*—Bishop Southgate has been engaged in preparing a treatise on the Anglo-American Church, which he proposes to publish in Armenian, Greek, and Arabic. His object is to exhibit her in her true colours to the Eastern; accordingly he sets forth (1) the antiquity of the Anglican Church as a proof, in part, of its being a true branch of the Church Catholic; (2) its relation to Rome; (3) its relation to the various Protestant denominations. The following are abridged extracts from the Bishop's report to the General Convention, of the two first years of his mission.

"Immediately upon my arrival I presented to the Greek and Armenian Patriarchs, translations, in Greek and Armenian, of the letters commendatory from our venerable Presiding Bishop. By both these patriarchs I was received with unmingled respect and cordiality, and the character of our intercourse up to this time has been the same. The letter to the Greek Patriarch was laid before the Episcopal Synod, and I presented, at his Holiness's request, a copy of our Prayer Book, in Greek, for his better information concerning our Church. Another copy of the Presiding Bishop's letter was sent, in Arabic translation, to the Syrian Patriarch in Mesopotamia, with a communication from myself. I received, in due time, his friendly salutation. My intercourse with these three Patriarchs has been uninterrupted, and within the last year it has been extended to the Nestorian or Syro-Chaldean Patriarch, who has received, with great kindness and confidence, the presbyter whom I have sent into that country. Two of the patriarchs

to whom I first addressed myself, the Greek and the Syrian, have since died. The same relations are now maintained with their successors.

"Besides the Patriarchs, I am in relation with a large number of bishops, clergy, and principal laymen of the Oriental Churches, solely with reference to the welfare and improvement of their respective Churches. I have been freely consulted in their plans of usefulness, have offered suggestions, and aided them in such ways as seemed to promise the greatest utility. My suggestions have often been adopted.

"A considerable number of Armenians have been connected with our mission; and it was important that, in a time of great agitation of doctrinal and ecclesiastical questions, they should not be compelled to accede to more than the Church of Christ, in the best and purest ages, has prescribed for Christian communion. I have been happy in securing such terms for them, and in receiving the assurance of the Armenian Patriarch that his own views of official duty would not warrant him in prescribing any others. His Holiness has further assured me of his readiness to receive all upon the same Catholic terms, and has, through my instrumentality, admitted many who were alienated, and allowed many to remain who were not yet removed.

"It is a matter of great moment, in the present divided state of opinion in the Armenian Church, that its limits, in a word, should not be defined so as to exclude those who admit the rule of our own Reformation. There are many now in the Armenian communion, who, while sound and faithful Churchmen, are zealous to see the work of the Lord advancing among their countrymen. These men are clustering more and more around this mission, receiving their influences from it, and looking to it as presenting, in the Church which it represents, the best standard of a primitive faith and practice. These men will increase; and already, I trust, they are too numerous and too influential to allow terms less pure than those which we have lately secured to be enforced in time to come. The position which we, as a Church, have assumed here, seems to be the only means of saving the Eastern Churches from rationalism and infidelity on the one hand, or a degrading superstition on the other.

"One of our first cares was to provide a mission chapel, which was set apart for religious uses by a special form. Here we have had the daily services of the Church, and weekly communion, during a great part of the two years which have elapsed since my arrival. The service on Sunday evenings has ordinarily been in Turkish, and there has been preaching in that language when natives were present. The number of Oriental Christians who have attended at different times has been considerable, but we have never aimed to compose a formal congregation of them. This I do not think expedient, especially in the present excited state of the Oriental mind; and I doubt whether it would be consistent with the principles upon which the mission is based. I have always welcomed with gladness the presence of my Oriental brethren, and I shall never fail to speak to them a word in

season when they come. I have also, in a few instances, administered to them the Holy Sacrament, when they have presented themselves for it, and when I have known them to be in full communion in their own Churches, and worthy to be received in any Church on earth. This I have done upon the broad ground of Christian brotherhood.

"We have aided very largely Oriental schools. I have thought it best, instead of attempting the establishment of schools ourselves, to assist those of our native brethren. I have provided teachers in two instances, and supplied text-books, maps, and other articles. Some have been bestowed here, and some sent into the interior. I have given particular attention to the introduction of text-books in English for instruction in that language. Two of the pupils whom I have promised to take into our seminary, are two who have shown themselves the most advanced in native schools, where their instruction has come wholly from our benefactions. Not less, probably, than 1000 pupils have been so aided; and all, or nearly all, the text-books in English have been of a sound religious character, obtained from the Christian Knowledge Society of England.

"I have also engaged largely in the distribution of books. I have sent into the interior large numbers of Prayer Books, in Arabic and Turkish, religious tracts, and other works. Copies of the Scriptures, our own publications, tracts in English from the Protestant Episcopal Tract Society, and Prayer Books in various languages, have been sold or distributed here; many of these have also finally gone into the interior. I suppose that not far from 2000 copies have been distributed and sold within the last two years. The Prayer Books especially, in five or six different languages, have been valuable for this purpose, both as showing the character of our own Church, and giving, at the same time, the purest and most valuable religious instruction. I have received from one Patriarch the authority to translate into the modern language, for the use of his people, the Holy Scriptures, but I fear we are not yet ready for so great a work.

"The translations which we have accomplished within the last two years have been the following:—1. The Sermon of Bishop Seabury on Christian Unity, into Armenian. 2. A Treatise on the Anglican Branch of the Church of Christ, including the English, Scottish Episcopal, and American Episcopal Churches, by myself, into Armenian. 3. The same, into Arabic. 4. The Succession of the Church of England, the Episcopal Church of Scotland, and the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, into Arabic. 5. The American Communion Service, into Greek. 6. The same, into Armenian. 7. The Prayer Book of the Church of England, into Armenian. Of these the Sermon of Bishop Seabury, and the Prayer Book, in Armenian, have been published; the former 500, the latter 1000 copies. The Treatise on the Church, in Armenian, is about going to press. The Prayer Book has been our great work in this department. It has been printed at an Armenian press, by permission of the Patriarch. This is a sufficient answer to the objection, that we do not appear in

our real character in the East. Wherever we go, we go with the Prayer Book in our hand. Another publication has been the Psalms in Syriac, issued by the Bishop of the Syrian Church at Jerusalem, who has been for several years the representative of his Church in this city; and is now, by succession to the late Patriarch, the incumbent of the Syrian see at Antioch. He has aided us materially in our work, so far as his own Church was concerned, and has been in constant friendly intercourse with us up to the time of his recent departure for Mesopotamia. One-half of the edition was sent by a special messenger, to be circulated among the ancient Syrian Christians of Hindostan.

United States.—*Comparative Statistics of the American Church.*—The following table, taken from the statistical returns made to the General Conventions, will show the progress which the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States has made during the last twelve years:—

Returns made to the Convention of	1835.		1841.		1847.	
	Number of Dioceses.	*Return.*	*Number of Dioceses.*	*Return.*	*Number of Dioceses.*	*Return.*
Clergy	19 ..	763	25 ..	1,052	28 ..	1,404
Baptisms — Adults	11 ..	2,021	14 ..	4,729	21 ..	4,408
Baptisms — Infants	11 ..	10,371	14 ..	22,496	21 ..	23,551
Baptisms — Not specified	9 ..	9,457	9 ..	7,240	7 ..	5,815
Communicants added	6 ..	2,136	9 ..	3,678	11 ..	5,125
Total of Communicants	19 ..	36,416	25 ..	55,427	27 ..	67,550
Marriages	11 ..	5,416	17 ..	8,604	19 ..	6,826
Burials	11 ..	8,774	14 ..	14,961	19 ..	12,814
Sunday School Pupils	11 ..	28,661	10 ..	32,265	18 ..	39,437
Sunday School Teachers	11 ..	3,059	11 ..	3,974	16 ..	5,279
Clergy Deceased	8 ..	22	11 ..	28	15 ..	34

Relative increase of Churchmen and Dissenters.—From a comparative table of the places of worship belonging to the different denominations of Christians in New York, and of their increase during the last twenty years, it appears that the Church has increased in the largest ratio, having more than doubled within the period named, and now numbering forty-two places of worship.

New Jersey, St. Mary's Hall.—An institution "for female education on Christian principles," has been founded in New Jersey by Bishop Doane, under the name of St. Mary's Hall. It was first opened in 1837; it now numbers upwards of 130 pupils; and a chapel was consecrated last year. The course of instruction includes a primary department, into which applicants are at once received; a junior, middle, and senior class, into which they are successively admitted, as their attainments enable them to sustain an examination in the peculiar studies of each class. The subjects for the senior class are thus enumerated:—Elocution; Grammar, including analysis of English Poetry; Rhetoric; Logic; Algebra; Trigonometry; Astronomy, and Astronomical Geography, with the use of the Globes; Chemistry; Natural Philosophy; Christian Morals; General History; Exercises in Composition; Sacred Music. Instruction in Latin, Greek, French, Spanish,

Italian, German, Drawing, Painting, on the Harp, Piano, or Guitar, and in Singing, at the discretion of the rector. Pupils who have passed the senior class, and received a testimonial to that effect, are allowed, if they desire it, to remain in the hall, and be subject to its discipline, and to continue their studies.

Missionary Diocese of Wisconsin.—From the report of this diocese to the last General Convention, it appears that the Nashotah mission has an important bearing on the character and increase of the Church in Wisconsin; seven of the missionaries who are labouring in this territory having received their education there. There are thirty students, all of whom are looking forward to the ministry of the Church, and five of them are candidates for holy orders.

The Scandinavian station is spoken of as in a high state of spiritual prosperity; it is occupied by immigrants from Norway, Sweden, and Denmark, who in 1843 were at their request incorporated into the Protestant Episcopal Church of America. In the Oneida mission there are out of 800 persons under the charge of the missionary 169 communicants. The Oneida Indians have erected a neat Gothic church, called Hobart Church, the first Protestant Episcopal Church in the territory of Wisconsin. The diocese contains 22 clergymen, 25 parishes, 2744 persons enrolled in the registers, 969 communicants, and 407 children under catechetical instruction; 1123 adults and infants have been baptized, and 393 persons confirmed.

The Theological Institution at Nashotah.—A later account, given by the *John Bull*, contains the following additional particulars:—Since the ordination of the six in June last, twelve additional divinity students have been received into the institution; two from Philadelphia, four from New York, one from Boston, one from Maryland, two from Ohio, one from Mississippi. Two are Swedes, one is a Dane, one a Norwegian, four English, and one Irish; one a converted Israelite from St. Croix; and three Oneida Indians. It is in contemplation to receive three or six native Chinese, to educate for the China mission. In connexion with the institution a parish school has been established, in which forty children from the surrounding country are taught by the pupils of the institution. This is the first parish school west of the Lakes. A handsome church is about to be erected for this new parish, to be dedicated to St. Mark.

Slavery Law in Virginia.—The Toronto *Church* newspaper brings under public notice and reprobation the following fact, illustrative of the state of the law in the slave states of the American republic:—

In August last, Martha Christian was tried before the Court of Common Pleas, Wood County, Virginia, for a crime, the nature of which may be best described in the words of the indictment. "Wood County, to wit.—The grand jurors empanelled and sworn to inquire of offences committed in the body of said county on their oath present: That Martha Christian, late of said county, being an evil-disposed person, on the fourth day of July, in the year of our blessed Lord one thousand eight hundred and forty-seven, at Righteous Ridge, in said county, not

having the fear of God before her eyes, but moved and instigated by the devil, wickedly, maliciously, and feloniously, did teach a certain black and negro woman, named Rebecca, alias Black Beck, to read in the Bible, to the great displeasure of Almighty God, to the pernicious example of others in like case offending, contrary to the form of the statute in such case made and provided, and against the peace and dignity of the commonwealth of Virginia."

Upon this indictment Martha Christian was tried, and having been found guilty of aiding and abetting Satan to propagate the Gospel, she was adjudged to suffer ten years' imprisonment in the penitentiary! The judge, in passing sentence, commented upon the enormity of the convict's offence, and the great lenity and favour which had been exercised towards her. The *Church* animadverts on this transaction in terms of great but merited severity.

West Indies.—*State of the Church at St. Croix.*—St. Croix being a Danish island, the Lutheran is the established faith; but it is professed only by a small portion of the people. The remainder are Episcopalians, Roman Catholics, and Moravians. The former are the most numerous, amounting to about 8000 persons, or more than a third of the whole population. These are divided into two parishes. St. Paul's numbers 3000 persons, white and coloured, and about 500 communicants. It has a handsome and commodious church, a large Sunday school-house for the accommodation of 400 or 500 scholars, a hospital for the sick and indigent of the parish, and a comfortable parsonage. The other parish (St. John's) comprises the eastern part of the island; it numbers 5000, the communicants more than 1000. A large Sunday school-house has just been erected, capable of accommodating 1000 or 1200 scholars. The Danish government will not suffer more than these two parishes; the incumbents of both belong to the American Church.

INDEX

OF THE

REMARKABLE PASSAGES IN THE CRITICISMS,

EXTRACTS, NOTICES, AND INTELLIGENCE.

American Church, statistics of, 506.
Andersen, Hans Christian, his story of the Shoes of Fortune, 464.

Baptism, and its privileges—from Dr. Peile's Annotations on the Epistle to the Corinthians, 457.
Baptismal Regeneration, and the Baptismal Service, held by the early Church, Archdeacon Hoare's work on it, 460.
Bunsen, the Chevalier, his views on the History and Chronology of Egypt, 457.

Cemetery, the; a Poem on the Subject of Extra-mural Burial, 216.
Ceylon, Mission at Mahere, 489.
Chartism, and the working classes, 194; universal suffrage, 195.
Church and State, relations of, considered, 157; great changes in them, 158; historically traced from the Reformation, 159, 160; modern views on this subject, 161, 162; Dr. Merle d'Aubigné's opinions on it, 163, 164; Union of Church and State, formerly desirable, 165; State retains powers without performing duties, 166; in Church patronage in Ireland, 167—169; in England, 170, 171; Dr. Hampden and Bishop of Manchester, 172; politics of bishops, 173; metropolitans, 174; present bishops, 175, 176; this subject viewed spiritually, 177; the episcopal office, 178, 179; a synod proposed for the nomination of bishop, 180; warnings from the past and present, 181, 182; indifference or hostility of the State, 183, 184; the Church must free herself, 185; and defend her temporalities, 186; warned by the destruction of Church property in Ireland, 187; the laity to be associated in Church legislature, 188; the Church must *influence* the State, 189; review of present policy and events, 190—193.
Consistorial Churches of France, tests defining Church membership, 496.

Davis, Andrew Jackson; his pretensions to be a prophet, 205; his ideas of the inhabitants of the planets, 206.
Development, controversy in the Church of Rome, 96; Mr. Newman's Essay on this subject, 97; how received amongst Romanists, 98; by the Dublin Review, 99; this doctrine unknown to their former theologians, 100; evidence of change amongst them, 101; opposed by "Brownson's Quarterly Review," 102; Rome's arbitration expected, 103; the Reviewer states the doctrine as given by Mr. Northcote, 104; and Mr. Newman, 105; denounces it as "uncatholic," 106; and rationalistic, 107, 108; and imputing incompleteness to original revelation, 110; Dublin Review's answer to these charges, 111; disclaims

the notion of a new school, 112; re-asserts the doctrine, 113; the reply of Brownson's Review, 114—116; indignant at the application of the doctrine to fundamental mysteries, 117; opposes to it the doctrine of the Roman Church, 118; the Dublin Review replies, 119; refers to school divines little known, 120; this a most important controversy, 121; its consequences, 122, 123; the doctrines of the two schools contrasted, 124—126; the doctrine of the Church of England, 127.

Disunion, its attendant expense, in America, 215.

Egypt, views of the Chevalier Bunsen, on its history and chronology, 457.

Election, the doctrine of, 218.

Farms, the advantage of small farms, 208; pauperism to be ascribed to their consolidation in the 15th century, 209.

France, democratic demonstration of the French bishops, 234—253; position of the Romish clergy, 490.

French Revolution, Archbishop of Paris' apology for, 236—239.

Germany, new Church constitution, 497.

Greece, present position of, 338; its historical association, 339; English and Russian influence with Greece, 340—344; Coletti, 345; Mavrocordato, and the Phanarcotes, 346; King Otho, 347; he dismisses Armansperg, 348; recalls Mavrocordato, 349; revolution of 1843, 350; Otho forms a constitution, 351; English parliamentary attacks on Greece, 352; and on King Otho, 353—360; system of finance, 361; national debt, 362, 363; revenue, 364, 365; agriculture, 366; intellectual state, 367; the budget, 368; English policy in Greece, 369.

Harold, by Sir Edward B. Lytton, neither a romance, nor a history, 465; a mere sketch, 466; dubious in its Christianity, 467.

Humboldt, William Von, his contemporaries, 1; his mind, 2; early life, 3; his reserve of manner, 4; his rationalism, 5; his fear of dogmatic religion, 6; his praying under anxiety, 7; his criticism on poetry and taste, 8; political opinions, 9; his friendship for Schiller and Goethe, 10; his essay on poetry, 11; his, the realization of a noble German character, 12.

In Cœnâ Domini, Bull in, published for the National Club, 90; history of 91; present validity of it, 92; its hindrance to diplomatic intercourse with the Pope, 93; it exempts the Pope from maintaining international treaties, 94; importance of its publication amongst us, 95.

Irvingism, its stronghold in Newman-street, 13; its founder, 14; Mr. Drummond's lectures on it, 15; absence of distinguishing tenets, 16; of humility and charity, 17; claim to a new dispensation, 18; the work of the evil one, 19; Mr. Baxter's account of it, 20; first utterance of "the tongues" in public, 21; by a "false prophetess," 22; similar to the "French prophets," 23; their failure, 24; Mr. Baxter's "utterance," 25; its effect on him, 26; its failure, 27; his sufferings, 28; and doubts, 29; Mrs. C.'s "utterance," 30; evil spirits, 31; case of exorcism, 32; Mr. Baxter convinced that it is the work of Satan, 33; letter from Mr. Irving, 34; heretical tenets, 38; inconsistencies, 39; secresy, 40; Mr. Irving's death, 41; succeeded by Mr. Drummond, 42; his views, 43; on "the seal of the Spirit," 44; the episcopate, 45; and the Pope, 46; some truths in the system, 48; the consequence of modern errors, 49; one of the "signs of the times," 50.

Jesuitism, system of, 391, 392; its zeal and obedience, 393; historical deposition against it, 394—396; state of the Church before its rise, 397—400; it is devoted to the service of the Pope, 401; usurps the functions of all clergy, 402; is a monarchy, 403—406; the name of Jesuit, 407—409; privileges and exemptions of the Jesuits, 411—419; charges against them by Romanists, 420—424; impotence of the Popes to control them, 425—428; Ganganelli's attempted suppression of them, 429; his death, 430—433; the Jesuits resist their suppression, 434, 435; Jesuitism, in its relations to the State, 436, 437; its supremacy to the civil powers, 438—440; its riches, 441; its influence, 442; crimes, 443, 444; and intrigues, 445; places from which it has been expelled, 446, 447; review of its system, 448—452.

Jones, Ernest, the Chartist poet, 194; his poem of "Lord Lindsay," 196; and "Our Warning," 197.

Klopstock, his poem of "The Rose Wreath," translated by Mr. Nind, 475.

Luxury and Want, in our great cities, 222.

M'Hale, Dr., his letters to Lord Arundel, Lord Shrewsbury, and Lord John Russell, 128; state of feeling in Ireland, 129; Dr. M'Hale defends priestly denunciations, 130, 131; the case of Major Mahon, 132; murder palliated by the Irish Radical press, 133; three parties among Irish Repealers, 134—136; priestly influence over the people, 137, 138; Young Ireland, 139, 140; Mr. Mitchell and "The United Irishman," 141—144; cases of murder tried by the Special Commission, 145—154; conclusions drawn from these facts, 155, 156.

Madeira, English chaplaincy at, 298; Episcopal right of *collation*, 299; usurped by Lord Palmerston, 300, 301; consequences of this, 302; Mr. Brown's pamphlet, 303; his ideas of Episcopal authority, 304—310; attack on Mr. Lowe, 311; the falsehood of it, 312; as shown by the printed statement, 313, 314.

Madras, schools of Tamil and Telugoo, 498.

Mauritius, state of the mission, 499.

Montgomery, Mr., his essay on "The Great Salvation," 219; and the neglect of it, 220.

Montreal, Bishop of, his appeal on account of the chaplaincy, at the quarantine station at Grosse Isle, 487.

Mustapha Sherif, preaching to Christian Bishops, 499.

New Brunswick, state of the diocese, 254. 499.

New Zealand, clergy educated in the diocese, 500.

Nind, Mr., his translation of Klopstock's poem of "The Rose Wreath," 475.

Papacy, the—Cardinal Mastaï Ferretti's unanimous election to, 255; sudden change of feeling, 256; its causes, 257; the Papacy suits its principles to the times, 258; embraces democratic principles, 259, 260; Pius IXth's popularity as a Reformer, 261; his encyclic, 262—266: remarks on it, 267; his conduct encourages liberalism generally, 268, 269; Father Ventura's sermon, 270; Pius IX. protests against the radicals, 271—274; his altered reception, 275; his proclamation, 276: plans a representative government, 277; French republic proclaimed, 278; constitution published at Rome. 279—281; expulsion of the Jesuits, 282; refusal to declare war with Austria, 283; prostration of the Papal power, 284, 285.

Polynesia, Dr. Coulter's voyages, these compared with Mr. Melville's, 51; visit to Juan Fernandez, 52; the Gallapagos, 53; Chatam Island, 54; search for water, 55; discovery of coal, 56; of a skeleton, 57; the Marquesas, 58; the French at Tahiti, 59; native women on board the vessel, 61; immorality, 63; treachery, 65; happiness of civilized and uncivilized life contrasted, 68; happy life in Typee, 70; polygamy, 71; religious ceremonies, 72; ancient remains, 73; Mr. Melville's strictures on the missionaries, 74; native dance, 75; Kingsmill Islands, 76; New Zealand, 78; New Guinea, 81; the tribe of Hocrafocas, 82; the founding of a Christian colony in Polynesia, urged, 84.

Pope Pius IX., his Episcopal appointments, 253; his brief to the Apostolic nuncio at Paris, given at Santa Maria Maggiore, March 18, 1848, 493.

"*Rest in the Church*," remarks on the tale of, 371, 372; causes of the apostasy of its author, 373, 374; her self-will, 375; though talking of obedience, 376; her views on Anglicanism, 377; her fear of intellect, 378; her praise of "Puseyism," 379; her views on spiritual mortification, 380—383; and absolution, 384; addresses to the Virgin, 385, 386; apostasy from the Church, and fear of returning, 387—390.

Schiller, translations from his poems, by Mr. Swayne, 469.

Seychelles Islands, population of, 503.

Shanghai, American missionary bishop there, 490.

Southgate, Bishop, his treatise on the Anglo-American Church, 503; his translations into Armenian, Greek, and Arabic, 505.

Swayne, Mr., his translations from Schiller

and Uhland, very bad, 468; the "Lay of the Bell," 469; the "Combat," 470.

Tasmania, Bishop of; his charge, 224; his firm and intrepid opposition to Lord Stanley's attempt at a new ecclesiastical organization in Tasmania, 225.

Taylor, Bishop Jeremy, his life, by Mr. Wilmott, 315; a Saint of the English Church, 316; mediæval Saints, 317, 318: Anglican Saints, 319, 320; revival of persecution, 321; Romish saintliness, 322—325; Mr. Newman's opinion on it, 326, 327; Wilmott's Life of Taylor, 328; Taylor in the Civil Wars, 329—331; domestic sorrows, 332; death, 333; views on Divine mercy, 334; description of final retribution, 335—337.

Tennyson, his poem of the Princess, 286; his views of woman's sphere, 287—289; his style, 290, 291; extracts from the Princess, 292—296; criticism on it, 297.

Thiers, M., Letter of, on the Ecclesiastical Affairs of France, May 2, 1848, 494.

Thornton, Mr.; his work on Peasant Proprietors, 208; pauperism, the consequence of the consolidation of small farms, 209.

Toronto, Church Statistics of the Diocese, 231.

Tupper, Martin F.; his "Proverbial Philosophy," 199; and Hactenus, 201.

Warburton, Acton, his "Rollo and his Race; or, Footsteps of the Normans," 453; notice of the Dukes of Normandy, 454; of William the Conqueror, 455; his remarks on ever open churches, 456.

West Indies, Lutheran Church of St. Croix, 508.

Woodward, the Rev. Henry, his character and views, 85; not of the "Evangelical" party, 86; on baptism, 87; practical piety, 88.

THE END OF VOL. IX.

GILBERT & RIVINGTON, Printers, St. John's Square, London.

INDEX

OF

BOOKS REVIEWED.

*** For remarkable Passages in the Criticisms, Extracts, Notices, and Intelligence, see the Index at the end of the Volume.

Adventures in the Pacific, &c. By John Coulter, M.D., 51.

Adventures on the Western Coast of South America, including a Narrative of Incidents at the Kingsmill Islands, New Ireland, New Britain, New Guinea, and other Islands in the Pacific Ocean. By J. Coulter, M.D., 51.

Ainger—Sound Education, &c. A Sermon. By the Rev. Thomas Ainger, M.A., 484.

Allies—The Church of England cleared from the charge of Schism. By the Rev. T. W. Allies, M.A., 804.

Andersen—The Shoes of Fortune, and other Tales. By Hans Christian Andersen, 464.

Annesley, and other Poems. By Anne Harriet Drury, 480.

Anti-Revolutionary Tracts, 484.

Apocalypse, Harmony of the. By the Rev. W. H. Hoare, M.A., 463.

Archæologia Hibernica, a Handbook of Irish Antiquities. By W. F. Wakeman, 228.

Architecture, an attempt to discriminate the Styles of, in England. By Thomas Rickman, 459.

Baptism, Scripturally illustrated and explained. By the Ven. C. J. Hoare, Archdeacon of Surrey, 460.

Baron's Little Daughter, the Tale of, 477.

Barter—The Gainsaying of Core. By the Rev. W. B. Barter, 229.

Baxter—Village Sermons. By the Rev. Arthur G. Baxter, 226.

Bell, the, its Origin, History, and Use. By the Rev. Alfred Gatty, M.A., 211.

Beloved Disciple, the. Reflections on the History of St. John. By Mrs. J. B. Webb, 227.

Biber — The Royal Supremacy over the Church considered as to its Origin, and its Constitutional Limits, &c. By the Rev. G. Biber, LL.D., 473.

Bible Cartoons, 230.

Birks—Letter to Lord John Russell on the admission of Jews into Parliament. By the Rev. T. R. Birks, M.A., 157.

Birks — The Christian State; or First Principles of National Religion. By the Rev. T. R. Birks, M.A., 157.

Blake, William; or the English Farmer. By the Rev. W. E. Heygate, 457.

Boutell—Monumental Brasses. By Mr. Boutell, 230.

Boyd—England, Rome, and Oxford, compared as to certain Doctrines, in Six Lectures. By the Rev. Archibald Boyd, 214.

Brown—The Madeira Chaplaincy treated of, in a Letter to the Rev. R. T. Lowe. By Rev. T. K. Brown, 298.

Brownson's Quarterly Review. No. 1, January, 1847; No. 4, October, 1847, 96.

Bunsen—Egypt's Place in Universal History. By Christian C. J. Bunsen, translated from the German by Charles Cottrell, 457.

Burlington College, Address on the Ends and Objects of. By Bishop Doane, 484.

Butler's Three Sermons on Human Nature. Edited by W. Whewell, D.D., 482.

Campden. — The British Chaplaincy in Madeira. By Viscount Campden, 224.
Carleton — The Emigrants of Ahadarra. By W. Carleton, 212.
Cemetery, the ; an Appeal in behalf of Extra-Mural Burial, 216.
Chalmers—Posthumous Works of Thomas Chalmers, D.D. Edited by Rev. W. Hanna, 461.
Chartist Lyrics. By Ernest Jones, 194.
Children, the Way of the Church with. Four Sermons. By Bishop Doane, 484.
Choristers, Historical Notices of the Office of. By the Rev. J. E. Millard, 459.
Christian State ; or the First Principles of National Religion. By the Rev. T. T. Birks, M.A., 157.
Christianity, Nature of. Five Sermons. By W. H. Mill, D.D., 461.
Christians, Discourse on the Moral Power of. By the Rev. Dr. Lyon, 229.
Church and State, Principles of the English Constitution in, 483.
Church and State, Reciprocal Obligations of. By John Lockhart Ross, 477.
Church and State, Relations of. By the Rev. J. R. Pretyman, M.A., 157.
Church Leases. By W. H. Grey, 484.
Church Service, Conversations on the, 478.
Churchman's Companion, the, 484.
Citizenship, Christian Obligations of. By the Rev. John Sheppard, M.A., 221.
Clancarty, Earl of—The Oath of Supremacy inconsistent with the Provisions of the Irish Charitable Bequests' Act. By the Earl of Clancarty, 483.
Collects, the, rendered into verse, 203.
Commentary on the Book of Acts. By the Rev. W. G. Humphry, M.A., 213.
Communion of Saints, Sermon on. By the Rev. E. M. Johnson, 484.
Communion Services Considered. By Philo-Biblion, 218.
Constance, a Tale, 210.
Cope—Visitatio Infirmorum ; or Offices for the Clergy with the Sick. By the Rev. W. H. Cope, and the Rev. H. Stretton, 205.
Coulter—Adventures in the Pacific. By John Coulter, M.D., 51.
Coulter—Adventures on the Western Coast of South America, and the Islands in the Pacific Ocean. By John Coulter, M.D., 51.
Crakanthorp — Defensio Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ. Auctore Ricardo Crakanthorp, S.T.P., 482.
Cust—Noctes Dominicæ ; or Sunday Night Reading. By the Hon. Sir Edward Cust, 228.

D'Aubigné—Germany, England, and Scotland. By J. H. Merle D'Aubigné, D.D., 157.
Davis—The Principles of Nature, her Divine Revelations, and a Voice to Mankind. By Andrew Jackson Davis, the "Poughkeepsie Seer," 205.
Dictionary, Technological, &c. Edited by John Ogilvie, LL.D., 481.
Doane—Address on the Ends and Objects of Burlington College. By Bishop Doane, 484.
Doane—The Way of the Church with Children. By Bishop Doane, 484.
Drummond, Mr.—Lectures delivered in the Churches, 13.
Drury—Annesley, and other Poems. By Anne Harriet Drury, 480.
Dublin Review. No. XLIV., July, 1847; No. XLVI., January, 1848, 96.

Ecclesia Dei ; a Vision of the Church, 207.
Ecclesiologist, the, 484.
Ecclesiology, Sketches of Continental. By the Rev. Benjamin Webb, M.A., 228.
Edmonstone—On the Observance of Lent. By Sir A. Edmonstone, 230.
Education—Proposal for the Adjustment of the Education Question. By the Rev. Downes Willis, 230.
Egypt's Place in Universal History ; an Historical Investigation. By the Chevalier Bunsen, 457.
Election of Grace, a Practical Exposition of the. By the Rev. Sir Charles Hardinge, Bart., 218.
Elrington — Life of Archbishop Ussher. By C. R. Elrington, D.D., 204.
Emigrants of Ahadarra, tale of the. By W. Carleton, 212.
Emily Vernon ; or Self-sacrifice, 223.
England, Rome, and Oxford, compared as to certain Doctrines. By the Rev. Archibald Boyd, 214.
Epitaphs, Hints for, in Country Churchyards, 211.
Essington—The Middle Way. A Sermon. By the Rev. R. W. Essington, M.A., 484.
Evans—Scripture Biography. By the Rev. Robert Wilson Evans, B.D., 476.
Faith, Scriptural idea of. By G. H. Nash, A.M., 227.
Family Burying-places, thoughts on, 211.
Family Prayers for every Day in the Week,

for the use of Cottagers. By Clergymen of the Deanery of Bridport, 478.
Fewell—Essays of Opinions, for Churchmen, 215.
Froissart—The Chroniclers of England, France, Spain, &c. By Sir John Froissart, 210.

Gainsaying of Core, the. By the Rev. W. B. Barter, 229.
Gatty—The Bell; its Origin, History, and Use. By the Rev. Alfred Gatty, M.A., 211.
Geale—Notes of a Two Years' Residence in Italy. By Hamilton Geale, 475.
German Literature, beauties of, selected from various authors, 220.
Germany, England, and Scotland. By Merle D'Aubigné, D.D., 157.
Godfrey Davenant, a Tale of School Life. By the Rev. W. J. Heygate, M.A., 222.
Gospel, the, Narrative of our Lord's Ministry (the second year) Harmonized. By the Rev. Isaac Williams, 227.
Gospel Hymns. By the Rev. T. Salwey, B.D., 214.
Gray—History of Rome, for young persons. By Mrs. Hamilton Gray, 210.
Grey—Church Leases. By W. H. Grey, 484.
Grover—A Voice from Stonehenge. By the Rev. H. M. Grover, 224.

Hactenus. Lyrics. By Martin Tupper. 198.
Hall—Prayers for the Use of Families and for Private Devotion. By the Rev. W. J. Hall, 214.
Hampden — Epitome of Dr. Hampden's Bampton Lectures, 229.
Hampden—Letter to Dr. Hampden. By Rev. Mr. Irons, M.A., 229.
Hampden—Letter on Dr. Hampden's Writings. By W. H. Mill, D.D., 229.
Hardinge — Practical Exposition of the Election of Grace. Four Sermons. By the Rev. Sir Charles Hardinge, Bart., 218.
Harold, the Last of the Saxon Kings. By Sir E. B. Lytton, 465.
Harper—Sermon on behalf of the Bideford National Schools. By the Rev. T. N. Harper, 229.
Heathen Mythology, stories from. By the Rev. J. M. Neale, M.A., 218.
Heygate—Godfrey Davenant, a Tale of School Life. By the Rev. W. E. Heygate, M.A., 222.
Heygate—William Blake; or, the English Farmer. By the Rev. W. E. Heygate, 457.
Hicks—The Church of England Protestant's Manual of Family Devotion. By William Power Hicks, 476.
Hill—Scenes of 1792; or, a Tale of Revolution. By the Rev. G. D. Hill, M.A., 477.
Hoare—Baptism Scripturally Illustrated and Explained. By the Ven. C. J. Hoare, Archdeacon of Surrey, 460.
Hoare—The Harmony of the Apocalypse. By the Rev. W. H. Hoare, M.A., 463.
Holy Baptism, a Dissertation. By the Rev. W. Maskell, M.A., 474.
Holy Communion, Plain Lectures on. By the Rev. Pelham Maitland, 229.
Holy Orders, a Guide to Candidates for. By the Rev. C. M. Mount, A.M., 474.
Humboldt, William Von, Reminiscences of. By Gustavus Schlesier, 1.
Humphry—Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles. By the Rev. W. G. Humphry, M.A., 213.

In Cœnâ Domini—The Bull "In Cœnâ Domini," translated into English, with a short Historical Introduction; and evidence of its present validity, as part of the Roman Law, and of its recognition by the Romish Hierarchy in Ireland. Published for the National Club, 90.
A Letter to the Earl of Arundel and Surrey, on the Bull "In Cœna Domini." By the Editor of the Bull, as published for the National Club, 90.
Papal Diplomacy and the Bull "In Cœnâ Domini;" or, a collection of Authentic Facts and Documents, proving that the principles of the Bull "In Cœnâ Domini" are the only principles of international law recognized by the Papacy. By the Editor of the Bull, as published for the National Club, 90.
Intermediate State, three Chapters on the, 211.
Ireland, History of the Holy Catholic Church in. By George King, A.B., 226.
Irish Presbyterian Church, Inaugural Address at the College of the General Assembly of the. By Edward Masson, 229.
Irvingism — Lectures delivered in the Churches. By Henry Drummond.
A Discourse on the Office of Apostle.
The Liturgy and other Divine Offices of the Church, 13.
Italy, Notes of a Two Years' Residence in. By Hamilton Geale, 475.

Jamaica, Report of the Committee of the Chamber of Commerce, 229.
James — Thoughts on Passages selected from the Fathers. By the Rev. J. B. James, B.A., 215.
Jesuits, History of the Fate of the. By Count Alexis de Saint-Priest, Peer of France, 391.
Jews in Parliament, admission of. Letter to Lord John Russell. By the Rev. T. R. Birkes, M.A., 157.
Johnson—Sermon on the Communion of Saints. By the Rev.E.M.Johnson, 484.
Jones—Chartist Lyrics. By Ernest Jones, 194.
Jones—Lord Lindsay. A Poem. By Ernest Jones, 194.
Jackson—Sanctifying Grace, and the Grace of the Ministry. A Sermon. By the Rev. J. Jackson, M.A., 484.

Kennaway—Sermons preached at Brighton. By the Rev. C. E. Kennaway, M.A., 221.
King—The Little Red Book ; or, the History of the Holy Catholic Church in Ireland. By George King, A.B., 226.
Klopstock, Odes of. Translated from the German. By William Nind, 475.

Latin Church—the, during Anglo-Saxon Times. By H. Soames, M.A., 458.
Lawson—Plain and Practical Sermons. By the Rev. G. N. Gray Lawson, M.A., 219.
Lent—on the Observance of. By Sir Archibald Edmonstone, 230.
Lord Lindsay—A Poem. By Ernest Jones, 194.
Loss and Gain, 223.
Lowe—Protest against the Ministration in Madeira of Rev. T. K. Brown. By Rev. R. T. Lowe, 298.
Lowe, Rev. R. T.—Appendix to Protest, &c., 298.
Ludwig Tieck—Select Tales and Romances from the German of, 220.
Lyon—Discourse on the Moral Power of the Christian. By Rev. Dr. Lyon, 229.

Macleane—Sermons for Schools and Families. By the Rev. A. G. Macleane, B.A., 473.
Madeira—British Chaplaincy in. By Viscount Campden, 224.
Madeira—Protest against the Ministration of Rev. T. K. Brown in Madeira. By Rev. R. T. Lowe, 298.
Madeira Chaplaincy, the. By the Rev. T. K. Brown, 298.
Maitland — Plain Lectures on the Holy Communion. By the Rev. Pelham Maitland, 229.
Manchester, Duke of—The Finished Mystery ; and an Examination of Mr. Brown on the Second Advent. By George, Duke of Manchester, 208.
Manual of Family Devotion. By W. P. Hicks, 476.
Martineau—What is my Duty? Edited by the Rev. Arthur Martineau, M.A., 211.
Maskell—Holy Baptism : a Dissertation. By the Rev. W. Maskell, M.A., 474.
Masson—An Inaugural Address at the College of the General Assembly of the Irish Presbyterian Church. By Edward Masson, 229.
Matutina — Morning Readings adapted to the use of younger Members of the Church of England. By the Rev. George Renaud, M.A., 478.
M'Clelland—Predestination and Election vindicated from dependence on Moral Necessity. By George M'Clelland, 482.
M'Hale—Letters of Dr. M'Hale to Lord Arundel, Lord Shrewsbury, and Lord John Russell, 128.
Melville—Adventures in the South Seas. By Herman Melville, 51.
Melville—Residence among the Marquesas Islands. By Herman Melville, 51.
Mill—Five Sermons on the Nature of Christianity, preached before the University of Cambridge. By W. H. Mill, D.D., 461.
Mill — Letters on Dr. Hampden's Writings. By W. H. Mill, D.D., 229.
Millard—Historical Notices of the Office of Choristers. By the Rev. J. E. Millard, B.A., 459.
Ministry of the Word, Treatise on the. By the Rev. Scott F. Surtees, 214.
Monro — The Combatants : an Allegory. By the Rev. Edward Monro, 474.
Montgomery—The Great Salvation, and our sin in neglecting it. By the Rev. Robert Montgomery, M.A., 219.
Montgomery — The Scottish Church and the English Schismatics, 228.
Monumental Brasses. By Mr. Bontell, 230.
Mount—A Guide to Candidates for Holy Orders. By the Rev. C. M. Mount, A.M., 474.
My Life—A Poem, 194.

Nash—The Scriptural Idea of Faith. By F. H. Nash, A.M., 227.

Nature, the Principles of; her Divine Revelations, and a Voice to Mankind. By Andrew Jackson Davis, the Poughkeepsie Seer, 205.

Neale—Stories from Heathen Mythology and Greek History, for Children. By the Rev. J. M. Neale, M.A., 218.

Newman—The Gospel of Christ the Power of God unto Salvation, exemplified in the Apostle Paul. By the Rev. W. A. Newman, M.A., 226.

Nimrod—A Dramatic Poem, 478.

Nind—Odes of Klopstock from 1747 *to* 1780. Translated from the German by William Nind, 475.

Noctes Dominicæ, or Sunday Night Reading. By the Hon. Sir Edward Cust, 228.

Nottidge, Rev. J. T., Sermon on the Death of. By the Rev. J. W. Reeve, 219.

Now and Then. By Samuel Warren, 212.

Nugee—The Spirit of Romanism. By the Rev. G. Nugee, M.A., 229.

Ogilby—Address to the Students of the General Theological Seminary. By Dr. Ogilby, 484.

Ogilvie. The Imperial Dictionary, English, Technological, and Scientific. Edited by John Ogilvie, LL.D., 481.

Omoo—A Narrative of Adventures in the South Seas, being a sequel to the "Residence in the Marquesas Islands." By Herman Melville, 51.

Peasant Proprietors, a Plea for; and their Establishment in Ireland. By W. H. Thornton, 208.

Peile—Sermon in aid of the Fund for the Erection of St. Alkmond's Church, Derby, 229.

Peile—Annotations on St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians. By T. W. Peile, D.D., Head Master of Repton School, 462.

Pellew—Sermons of the Hon. George Pellew, D.D., Dean of Norwich, 483.

Pope Pius IX., his Encyclic addressed to all Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops, and Bishops; given at Santa Maria Maggiore, Nov. 20, 1846, 255.

——— *his Allocution, pronounced in the Secret Consistory of Dec.* 17, 1847, 255.

——— *his Allocution, pronounced in the Secret Consistory of April* 29, 1848, 255.

Pope Pius IX., his Proclamation, given at Santa Maria Maggiore, May 1, 1848, 255.

Prayers for the use of Families, and for Private Devotion. By the Rev. W. J. Hall, 214.

Predestination and Election. By George M'Clelland, 482.

Pretyman—Relations of Church and State. By Rev. J. R. Pretyman, M.A., 157.

Princess, the. By Alfred Tennyson, 286.

Rawnsley—Village Sermons. By R. D. Rawnsley, M.A., 483.

Reeve—The Power of Divine Grace. By the Rev. J. W. Reeve, 219.

Renaud—Matutina: Morning Readings for the use of younger Members of the Church of England. By the Rev. George Renaud, M.A., 478.

Rest in the Church. By the author of "*From Oxford to Rome,*" 371.

Revolution, Tale of; or Scenes of 1792. By the Rev. G. D. Hill, M.A., 477.

Rickman—An attempt to discriminate the Styles of Architecture in England. By Thomas Rickman, 459.

Righteousness exalteth a Nation—Sermon. By the Rev. Dr. Wordsworth, 229.

Rollo and his Race, or Footsteps of the Normans. By Acton Warburton, 453.

Romanism, the spirit of. By the Rev. G. Nugee, 229.

Rome, History of, for Young Persons. By Mrs. Hamilton Gray, 210.

Ross—Reciprocal Obligations of the Church and the Civil Power. By John Lockhart Ross, M.A., 477.

Royal Supremacy, the, considered as to its Origin, and its Constitutional Limits, &c. By the Rev. G. Biber, LL.D., 473.

Sacro-Politica—The Rights and Relations, Civil and Spiritual, of the Anglican Church. By R. C. Sewell, D.C.L., 483.

Saint-Priest—History of the Fall of the Jesuits in the Eighteenth Century. By Count Alexis de Saint-Priest, 391.

Salwey—Gospel Hymns. By the Rev. T. Salwey, B.D., 214.

Sangster—The Servant's Claim upon the Christian Master. By the Rev. C. Sangster, M.A., Curate of High Hoyland, 465.

Schiller and Uhland, specimens from. By G. C. Swayne, M.A., 468.
Schism, the Church of England cleared from. By the Rev. T. W. Allner, M.A., 204.
Schlesier, Gustavus — Reminiscences of William von Humboldt, 1.
Scripture Biography. By the Rev. Robert Wilson Evans, B.D., Vicar of Haversham, 476.
Sermons for the People, 484.
——— *preached at the General Ordination of the Bishop of Oxford*, 484.
——— *preached at the opening of the Parish Church of Wellesbourne*, 484.
Sewell—The Danger and Safeguards of the Young in the present State of Controversy. By the Rev. S. Sewell, 484.
Sewell—Sacro-Politica; the Rights and Relations, Civil and Spiritual, of the Anglican Church. By R. C. Sewell, D.C.L., 483.
Sharpe's Magazine, 484.
Sheppard—The Christian Obligations of Citizenship. By the Rev. John Sheppard, M.A., 221.
Shunammite, the. By the Rev. Henry Woodward, 85.
Soames — The Latin Church during Anglo-Saxon Times. By H. Soames, M.A., 458.
Society — Essay on the Constitution of, 229.
Speculum Episcopi — The Mirror of a Bishop, 472.
Statute, fundamental, for the Temporal Government of the States of the Church. Given at Santa Maria Maggiore, March 14, 1848, 255.
Stonehenge, a Voice from. By the Rev. H. M. Grover, 224.
St. Paul, his Preaching and Writings exemplifying that the Gospel of Christ is the Power of God unto Salvation. By the Rev. W. A. Newman, M.A., 226.
Surtees—Treatise on the Ministry of the Word. By the Rev. Scott F. Surtees, 214.
Swayne — Specimens from Schiller and Uhland. By G. C. Swayne, M.A., 468.
Sworde—An Exposition of the first seventeen Articles of the Church of England. By Thomas Sworde, M.A., 476.

Tales of Adventure by Sea and Land, 210.
Tales of Kirkbeck; or, the Parish in the Fells, 461.
Tasmania—Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Tasmania. By the Bishop of Tasmania, 224.
Taylor, Bishop Jeremy, his Biography. By Rev. Robert Aris Wilmott, 315.
Tennyson—The Princess; a Medley. By Alfred Tennyson, 286.
The Fathers, thoughts on passages selected from the. By the Rev. J. B. James, B.A., 215.
The Great Salvation, and our sin in neglecting it. By the Rev. Robert Montgomery, 219.
Theologian and Ecclesiastic, the, 484.
Things after Death. The Intermediate State, Family Burying-places, and Epitaphs, 211.
Thornton—A Plea for Peasant Proprietors, with the outline for their Establishment in Ireland. By William Thomas Thornton, 208.
Tupper—Hactenus; Sundry of my Lyrics hitherto. By Martin Tupper, 198.
Typee; a Narrative of a four months' Residence among the Natives of a Valley of the Marquesas Islands. By Herman Melville, 51.

Ussher, Archbishop, Life of. By C. R. Elrington, D.D., 204.

Visitatio Infirmorum; or Offices for the Clergy with the Sick. By the Rev. W. H. Cope and Rev. H. Stretton, 205.
Via Dolorosa. Translated and arranged by the Author of "*From Oxford to Rome*," 477.

Wakeman — Archæologia Hibernica; a Handbook of Irish Antiquities. By W. F. Wakeman, 228.
Warburton — Rollo and his Race; or, Footsteps of the Normans. By Acton Warburton, 453.
Warren—Now and Then. By Samuel Warren, 212.
Warren—Sermons on Practical Subjects. By the Rev. Samuel Warren, LL.D., 483.
Watson—The Seven Sayings on the Cross. By the Rev. Alexander Watson, M.A., 476.
Watts—Divine and Moral Songs. By Isaac Watts, D.D., *with illustrations*, 474.
Webb—Sketches of Continental Ecclesiology. By the Rev. Benjamin Webb, M.A., 228.
Webb—The Beloved Disciple. Reflections on the History of St. John. By Mrs. J. B. Webb, 227.

What is my Duty? Edited by the Rev. A. Martineau, M.A., 211.

Whewell — Butler's Three Sermons on Human Nature. Edited by W. Whewell, D.D., 482.

Whewell—Sermons preached at Cambridge. By William Whewell, D.D., 482.

Wilberforce—Charge to the Clergy of the East Riding of Yorkshire.

Wilhelm Hauff, select popular Tales from the German of, 220.

Williams—The Gospel Narrative of our Lord's Ministry (the second year). Harmonized by the Rev. Isaac Williams, B.D., 227.

Willis—Outlines of Proposal for the adjustment of the Education Question. By the Rev. Downes Willis, 230.

Wilmott—Bishop Jeremy Taylor, his Predecessors, Contemporaries, and Successors. A Biography. By the Rev. R. A. Wilmott, 315.

Wood-Spirit, the. A Romance, 194.

Woodward—The Shunammite. By the Rev. Henry Woodward, M.A., 85.

Woodward—Essays and Sermons. By the Rev. Henry Woodward, M.A., 85.

Woodward—Some Passages of my former Life. By the Rev. H. Woodward, 85.

Woodward—Short Readings, Essays, and Sermons. By the Rev. Henry Woodward, 85.

Wordsworth—Discourses on the Canon of the Scriptures of the New Testament, and on the Apocrypha. By Christopher Wordsworth, D.D., 472.

Wordsworth — Righteousness exalteth a Nation. By the Rev. Christopher Wordsworth, D.D., 229.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA
3 0112 076144465